# National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, EDITOR.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

EDMUND QUINCY, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, COR. EDITORS.

VOL. XII. NO. 12. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST 14, 1851. WHOLE NO. 584.

Published weekly, on Thursday, by the AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY, at their office, No. 142 NASSAU STREET, NEW-YORK. Terms, TWO DOLLARS per annum. Printed for the American Anti-Slavery Society, by Norris & brother, printers.


## Selections.

A GREAT Anti-Slavery meeting is to take place on Monday evening, in Exeter Hall. The proceedings will have a special, if not an exclusive, reference to American Slavery. The meeting is called by the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society. It is high time that the New Broad-street body should begin to move in the matter of Slavery. They have done little for a long time past. Rather, we ought to say, they have done nothing at all. At least, if they have done anything, it has escaped our notice. If they have been at work, if they have been adopting decisive measures, with the view of putting down the greatest moral evil which at present exists in the earthly dominions of the Deity, we shall gladly and readily, on their being pointed out to us, repair the injury we have done the Anti-Slavery Society, in charging it with having done nothing for a long time past. If it has been labouring all the while, it must have been doing so in secret. Its good has been done by stealth. It has been carrying out the scriptural injunction, "Let not your left hand know what your right hand doeth," in a sense which was not contemplated by Him who uttered the words.

But we do not mean at present to refer at any length to the state of profound slumber in which the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society have been sunk for a long time past. That is a task which we shall probably undertake on an early day. Our present purpose is to ask that body what they *now* mean to do? Are we only to have a grand Anti-Slavery display on Monday night—dealing liberally in common-place denunciations of Slavery in the abstract, but adopting no vigorous, decisive, practical course of action? Are we simply to have over again the stereotyped invectives against slave-holders, which for many years have been the Anti-Slavery stock in trade of certain gentlemen who are regarded as Anti-Slavery geniuses of the first magnitude, by the junto in New Broad-street?

It is right we should say that we expect something more than this. But what that something is to be, is not yet given us to know. The day will declare it. Monday evening will enlighten our darkness. What we fear is, that there will be the semblance of doing something, and yet nothing in reality be done after all. We are apprehensive that some timid and trimming course will be proposed—something which will compromise the great principle, that humanity everywhere—in the southern States of America as well as on the shores of Great Britain, and under all its phases—whether the colour of the skin be black or white, posseses the same inalienable right to freedom; and that to deprive any fellow creature, by brute force, of that liberty which is the birth-right of all, is to commit against Heaven a crime of the deepest die, and to perpetrate one of the most atrocious outrages on humanity on which the sun ever gazed.

If the meeting of Monday is not to be a mockery, such a course of action will be resolved on as will precipitate a crisis in American Slavery. Resolutions will be adopted, calling on all ministers of the gospel, and members of Christian churches in this country, to have no fellowship with those Americans, when they come to England, who are holders of slaves, or the defenders of Slavery. If the promoters of the meeting be in earnest, they will farther pledge themselves that they shall not sit down at the communion table with any person, whom they know to be implicated, directly or indirectly, in the guilt of Slavery.

But the matter must not end here. It must be pushed much farther. The meeting of Monday, if it be in earnest, and resolved at all hazards to raze to the ground the hideous edifice of American Slavery, will pledge every man and woman present, who assents to the resolutions to be proposed, never to receive into their houses the abettors of Slavery, nor on any account, or under any circumstances, to interchange the usual courtesies of society with any upholder of the horrible system. Let a ban be put on every such person. No matter what may be his status in society, no matter what his intellectual acquirements, no matter how unexceptionable, in other respects, may be his moral character—these are all good and praiseworthy in themselves—qualities which all must admire and respect; but in combination with a maintenance of the system of American Slavery, they must be regarded as if they did not exist. A great principle is to be asserted. The most colossal, moral, and social evil under the sun is to be put down. No terms must, therefore, be held with the man who tramples that principle under foot, and does all that in him lies to uphold and perpetuate the evil of Slavery.

Is the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society prepared to adopt this course? Will that body, at the meeting of Monday, got up under its auspices, and whose proceedings will be regulated by its committee—will the Anti-Slavery Society have the moral courage, the firmness of purpose, the requisite disregard of personal friendships, and the recklessness of individual consequences, to pursue the line of conduct which we are recommending? If they do, they will not only give to American Slavery by far the heaviest blow which it has ever yet received, but a blow which will, ere long, prove fatal to the whole system. If we shrink from all personal contact with the convicted felon, even though the crime of which he has been found guilty be of minor turpitude, is it not a monstrous act of guilt to associate with the man-stealer—with the person who kidnaps or sells, as he would sell his goods and chattels, his fellow-creatures? If we would shrink back aghast from the man who has embrued his hands in human blood, do we not render ourselves liable to the charge of gross inconsistency if we can associate with the man whom we know to be the worst of all murderers—the systematic taker away of human life, by a course of cruelty which, sooner or later, inevitably consigns to the grave the victim of his cold-blooded oppression? Such are the American proprietors of slaves. Under this condemnation all those persons come who seek to uphold the iniquitous system.

There is just only one thing which is necessary to crown the guilt of the owners of American slaves, and the advocates of the system. It is, that such persons should be ministers of the Gospel, or flaming professors of Christianity. Now, it so happens, that among the owners of slaves in the southern States of America, and among the most zealous upholders of the system, are to be found a great majority of the evangelical divines of the United States, and a very large proportion of those laymen who have the highest reputation for religious principles. We unhesitatingly say, that but for these ministers and members of Christian churches, trans-Atlantic Slavery would have been abolished before now. They are its pillars. They are its main supporters.

For such persons we can hear no excuse. We can understand how others should practise and uphold Slavery; but how any man who professes to bow reverentially at the shrine of Christianity, and to submit to the authority of the inspired volume, should be an owner of his fellow-man—a trader in human beings—just as if they were so many beasts of the field, is one of those things at which we feel astounded. It utterly passes our comprehension.

We look forward to the meeting of Monday with intense interest, in order that we may see how the Anti-Slavery Society will demean itself towards such persons. It is well that the committee of that Society should be aware that they on their trial. It is for them to say whether they will avail themselves of the occasion, to retrieve their character, which has suffered much from their past want of fidelity to the principles on which their Society was founded, or whether their Society is to go to pieces. If they do not now come up to the mark, if they do not now come boldly forward, and refuse to hold any terms with the practisers or abettors of American Slavery, the Anti-Slavery Society must perish. Nothing can save it. It has been at death's door already. This is a crisis in its history, as it is in the history of trans-Atlantic Slavery. After Monday next, the Anti-Slavery Society will either be something or nothing—either a great and mighty confederation or a Society without prestige and without power, existing only in name, and only destined to have even a nominal existence, for a very brief period.—*London Morning Advertiser, July 19th.*

---

THE proceedings to-day in Exeter Hall will exercise a much greater influence on the destines of 3,000,000 human beings now in fetters in the Southern States of America, than the generality of those who may be present on the occasion are likely to have any idea of. Though we are several thousand miles distant from the localities in which American Slavery is rife and rampant, the public opinion of England has great weight on the other side of the Atlantic. The slaveholders and Slavery supporters in the United States, stand in awe of popular opinion in this country. The proofs of this everywhere abound. Whenever they can entangle in their meshes an intellectual man, especially if he be one who has it in contemplation to publish a work on America, they leave no effort to prevail on him to abstain from any allusion to Slavery in his work. If a minister of the gospel from this country visits the United States, the ministers of religion there contrive to interdict his uttering a word against Slavery in his sermons or prayers. And, if an author, whose works are republished on the other side of the Atlantic, has anything in them denunciatory of the sin and inhumanity of Slavery, that portion of his work which refers to the "domestic institution," is expunged, and nothing left to indicate to the trans-Atlantic reader, that the subject of Slavery has been referred to at all by the author.

It is satisfactory to find, that those on the other side of the Atlantic, who are the advocates and upholders of the iniquitous system, are afraid of the public opinion of England. The circumstance is one which ought to make us all the more careful to see that we are true to our convictions of the enormous sinfulness and inhumanity of Slavery, and that we make it a matter of conscience to give a fearless and energetic utterance to our feelings and sentiments on the subject.

For such an utterance of the national sentiment, a more favourable opportunity could not be afforded, than that which will be this day enjoyed in Exeter Hall. If the Anti-Slavery Society under whose auspices the assemblage is got up, prove unfaithful to the great cause, which it is, professedly, the sole object of their existence to promote, they will incur an amount of moral responsibility at which they may well stand appalled. If they fail in their duty, if they send forth an uncertain sound on the question of American Slavery, the meeting of to-night, instead of promoting, will do incalculable injury to the Anti-Slavery cause. Anything of a timid, trimming, compromising kind will cause the hearts of the slaveholders to beat with joy, and will fill the minds of the 3,000,000 unfortunate human beings whom they oppress and slowly murder, with sadness, if not with despair.

The gentlemen in New Broad-street, who are the prime movers in the matter, have not allowed any information to transpire respecting the course of action which they mean this evening to recommend. If that course of action be the right one, if it be such as the exigencies of the case require, we shall not quarrel with them for the reserve they have thought proper to maintain. But if they fail to propose the adoption of that course of bold, and determined, and uncompromising action which the necessities of the case so urgently demand, it shall not be our fault if their dereliction of duty be not brought with sufficient prominence before the public, in order that the country may be in a position to judge whether or not the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society is worthy of the confidence or countenance of the enemies of the "domestic institution" of America.

In our paper of Saturday, we expressed ourselves on this point in terms which could admit of no misapprehension. To our article on that day, we beg again to refer the committee of the Anti-Slavery Society. We then recommended a specific course of action. We repeat our recommendation. If American Slavery is to be abolished, we know of no more likely means of accomplishing that object, than by the foes of the system, in this country, who are ministers and members of Christian Churches, coming, in their congregational capacity, to a determination, that no owner of slaves, or advocate of Slavery shall ever be permitted to put foot in a pulpit in this land, or sit down at the communion-table. Now, one particular course of action which we would recommend for the adoption of the meeting this evening, is, that a resolution be proposed, pledging the ministers of the Gospel in this country, not to admit ministers of religion from America, who support Slavery, into their pulpits, and pledging the members of churches in England, not to accord privileges to laymen from America, who may be either slaveholders or slave-supporters. Such a resolution would be produtive of great results in America. It would bring trans-Atlantic divines and members of Churches on the other side of the water, to their senses. It would be a powerful practical protest against the iniquitous system, and would make itself felt in all parts of the United States. It would, farther, be a purging ot the churches in Great Britain from the guilt ot even indirectly sanctioning Slavery in the Southern States of America. At present, by receiving into their pulpits, and admitting to Christian privileges, American owners of slaves, and abettors of Slavery, the ministers and members of Churches in England, are partakers of their sins.

But we should like the meeting of this evening to go still farther than this. We should like to see a resolution passed, affirming the great principle, that not only ought American slaveholders, and supporters of Slavery, to be excluded from the pulpits ot England, and from Church communion, but from British homes and British Society. As men-stealers, they are to be regarded as criminals of the deepest dye, against the principles of humanity. They ought to be shunned as persons from contact with whom contamination would follow. If such a resolution were passed and carried out, the question of American Slavery would soon be brought to a crisis.

Should no one connected with the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, bring forward this evening such resolutions as we have suggested, we trust there will be found some one on the platform or in the body of the meeting, who will have the requisite regard for principle, and who is possessed of the necessary moral courage to take that step.—We can scarcely doubt that such resolutions, if brought forward, will be adopted, for we believe them to be in accordance with public feeling in this country. But even were they to be lost, through the opposition or indifference of the New Broad-street body, great good will still be the result; for we shall then be better able to judge, in the altered state of matters, of what stuff the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society are made of.—*Ibid, 21st July.*

---

OUR readers will find, in another part of our paper, as copious a report of the proceedings at the Anti-Slavery meeting, at Exeter Hall, last night, as the crowded state of our columns will permit.

It was, altogether, a sorry affair. It has more than realized our worst apprehensions. It professed to deal with American Slavery. It, in reality, did no such thing. It left the root of the evil untouched. It was a mere mockery. Meetings of a similar kind may be held till doomsday, without producing any beneficial result. The American slaveowners and the trans-Atlantic abettors of Slavery will chuckle with delight at the proceedings last night in Exeter Hall. The Doctors of Divinity both in the North and the South, will resign themselves to an unbounded exultation at the way in which the meeting passed off. Had it been got up under their auspices, the whole affair could scarcely have gone off more to their minds. DRS. SPRING, BEECHER, DEWEY, and the other "popular preaches" of America, whose very souls seem to gloat over the cruel and degrading bondage of three millions of human beings, all made in the image of their MAKER, might have framed, with the exception of some slight phrase or two, the resolutions which were last night proposed and adopted by the meeting. The American owners and upholders of Slavery, have very efficient auxiliaries and coadjutors in New Broad street.

From the very moment that the Chairman opened his lips, it was easy to anticipate the course which matters would take. Mr. GURNEY had not proceeded many sentences, before the cloven foot was betrayed. He hoped this meeting would speak with good temper and moderation of the American slave proprietors and supporters of Slavery. And why? For no other reason, forsooth, than that they are a sensitive people, and do not like to be roughly handled, or spoken of severely! Of course they do not. Who ever supposed they would? Did Mr. GURNEY ever yet know an instance in which a criminal liked to have his crimes held up to the indignant gaze of the public, or to hear them denounced in those terms which became the measure of their turpitude? Speak moderately and tenderly, indeed, of such atrocious criminals as those persons whose hands are embrued in the blood of their fellow men in the Southern States of America, and who, not satisfied with committing by their systematic cruelty, the crime of physical murder, daringly imperil the souls of their victims! Why, if there ever was a case in the universe of God, which not only justifies, but *demands*, a holy and burning indignation, it is the case of American Slavery, as practised in the Southern States, and as defended by ministers of the Gospel and members of Christian churches. But Mr. GURNEY, instead of commiserating the condition of the American slaves, seemed to reserve all his consideration for their oppressors. His bowels of compassion were for the latter. His only apprehension was lest anything should be said or done, which could hurt their feelings.

The late hour at which we write, as well as the pressure on our space, prevents our going fully into the proceedings of last night. It is difficult to say whether the Anti-Slavery Society most lamentably betrayed their duty in what they did, or in what they omitted to do. It was a melancholy trifling with the subject of American Slavery, to talk of what might be done, as one of the resolutions did, to put down the evil, by abstaining from the use of that which is grown or manufactured by slaves. This is to add deliberate mockery to the wrongs of the poor slaves. It is worse than the veriest trifling with the evil. It is a cruel outrage on the feelings of the poor creatures whose rescue from the fangs of their oppressors, was the professed object of the meeting last night.

And then with regard to what the New Broad street body did not recommend. They did not recommend—indeed it was not to be expected after the speech of their chairman that they would—that American ministers who support Slavery, should be excluded from the pulpits of England, and that church privileges should be denied to those laymen from the United States, who are either slaveowners or the upholders of Slavery. On these persons, who are the great props and pillars of the hideous fabric, the Anti-Slavery Society did not even venture to pronounce a vote of censure. For them they had no condemnatory resolution to propose.

But let us do our countrymen justice. The moral responsibility of all this rests on the Broad street junto, and on them alone. The resolutions were framed in that locality, and put into the hands of the movers and seconders, not only cut and dry, but actually printed. The meeting, it was evident, was deeply disappointed that no more decided course was proposed,—that no more vigorous line of action was recommended. The allusion made by one of the speakers to the duty which devolved on ministers in England, to exclude pro-slavery ministers from America, from our pulpits, and to refuse church privileges to American members of churches implicated in the guilt of Slavery, either as owners of slaves or as supporters of Slavery,—elicited loud cheers from the immense audience,—a circumstance which conclusively showed what the feeling of the meeting was.

It is matter of profound regret that there was no one on the platform, nor in the body of the meeting, to give expression, in the form of an amendment, to those feelings which evidently animated the breasts of the vast assemblage. Had any man of mark, accustomed to give utterance to his thoughts in public, had the courage to propose an amendment, laying down the principle that no American minister implicated in the guilt of Slavery, nor American layman, who supported the horrible system, should be admitted into an English pulpit, or receive the right hand of Christian fellowship in this country,—we have no doubt it would have been carried. It is lamentable to think that there was no such person present. There were those on the platform whom we would have expected to adopt this course. But it appears they shrunk from the task. Their courage, we fear, did not accord with their convictions.

But though the meeting of last night was in every respect, except in point of numbers, a melancholy affair, calculated rather to retard than to promote the cause of the abolition of Slavery in America, we implore the 3,000,000 human beings in bondage on the other side of the Atlantic, not to give way to despair. There is a feeling in their favour, which is hourly acquiring additional strength in this country, and which is extending among all classes with a rapidity altogether unprecedented, which will, ere long, burst asunder their fetters, and bid them go free. The day of their deliverance is not remote. It draweth nigh. It will come, perhaps, at a time when it is least looked for. But on that view of the question, we shall have more to say on an early occasion.—*Ibid, 22d July.*

---

WE published yesterday a letter from Mr. CHARLES GILPIN, in refrence to our article on Tuesday, on the Anti-Slavery Meeting of Monday. To-day, we insert a long and elaborate letter from Mr. SCOBLE, the Secretary of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, on the same subject.

Both our correspondents labour under the same misapprehension. They have failed to make a distinction, which we had fancied must have been obvious to all who read our article. Mr. GILPIN exclusively applies himself to the task of proving that the *speeches* at the meeting of Monday were imbued by a thoroughly Anti-Slavery spirit. We said nothing to the contrary. If Mr. GILPIN will re-peruse our article, he will find that we singled out no speech for condemnation, with the solitary exception of that of the Chairman. But now that the subject of the speeches is mooted, we have no hesitation in saying, that the succeeding speakers severally failed in their duty, in not distinctly and emphatically disclaiming all sympathy with Mr. GURNEY, when he so earnestly deprecated any "rough handling" of the American slaveholders and abettors of Slavery, and implored the speakers to deal with them tenderly, and to express themselves temperately, and with moderation, in their references to the great props and pillars of trans-Atlantic Slavery.

We say again that our observations were not levelled at the speeches or speakers,—not, at any rate, for what the latter *said*. Whatever blame attaches to them, consists in their not having said and done certain things, which we held to be indispensable to the success of the demonstration against Slavery. Our quarrel with them is, that they did not, in the first instance, proclaim aloud their repudiation of the chairman's views with regard to the tenderness with which the American slaveholders and advocates of Slavery, ought to be treated; and in the second place, that no amendment was moved to any of the resolutions, which would have pledged the meeting to exclude from the pulpits of England American ministers implicated in the guilt of Slavery—to refuse church privileges to American laymen, who were either slaveowners or Slavery supporters—and to shut the doors of English homes against slaveowniug or slavery-supporting Americans, whether preachers or laymen.

This, we still hold, ought to have been done, but it was not done. To that extent, and no more, do we blame the gentlemen who took part in the proceedings on Monday evening.

Mr. GILPIN, we take it for granted, will admit that this removes his ground of controversy with us, so far as respects the speakers and the speeches on Monday. With regard to the feeling which pervaded the vast assemblage, there never has been any difference of opinion between him and us. He bears his attestation to its thoroughly Anti-Slavery character. So far as we are concerned, Mr. GILPIN'S testimony was not needed. We expressed ourselves on the subject, on Tuesday, in terms which admit of no misconception. We then said, that had a resolution pledging the vast assemblage to adopt the course which we recommended, been proposed, the meeting would have heartily concurred in it. And we instanced, in proof of this, that the allusions made by one of the speakers, to the duty of English Christians to exclude American pro-slavery divines from our pulpits, and American pro-slavery laymen from church privileges, were received with loud applause.

But, leaving Mr. GILPIN, we now come to Mr. SCOBLE. The latter gentleman gives, as we have said, a long and elaborate account of what the Anti-Slavery Society has done, with reference to American Slavery, for the last ten years. We were not unacquainted with the facts to which he alludes, for we were present at the Conventions of 1840 and 1843. We can, therefore, bear our personal testimony to the accuracy of Mr. SCOBLE'S narrative of what the Anti-Slavery Society has done. The ground of difference between that body and ourselves is, that while what they have done was so far commendable, they have not done enough. It was right in them to record their "protests" against the sin of American Slavery, and "respectfully to suggest" that the American churches should purge themselves of those members who were implicated in the guilt of Slavery. But then we maintain, that this course of action was not sufficient. It did not meet the necessities of the case. We should not have quarrelled with the Anti-Slavery Society in New Broad street, for "protesting" and "respectfully remonstrating," in the first instance, with those ministers and members of the trans-Atlantic churches who were steeped to the ears in the pollutions of Slavery; but when they saw that their "protests," their "remonstrances," and their "resolutions," were all unheeded—making no more impression than the gentlest breath of wind, —then, we say, it behooved the Anti-Slavery Society to take up bolder and more determined ground. It then became their duty to tell the American pro-slavery divines, and members of churches, that they could no longer recognise them as Christians at all,—not at least, in reference to this question; and that, therefore, they could not be received into English pulpits, or admitted to church privileges on this side of the Atlantic, nor be permitted to cross the threshold of our homes. The best proof that the American ministers and members of churches, care not for the mild and moderate mode of expressing their views of trans-Atlantic Slavery, which the Anti-Slavery Society has adopted, is to be found in the fact, that they have up to this time, utterly disregarded it, and are still as much the strenuous upholders of Slavery as they ever were.

Mr. SCOBLE knows as well as we do, that a few years ago—after the Conventions of 1840 and 1843—there were several of the most notable of those northern divines who are the most zealous upholders of Slavery in this country; and he knows that these men not only found ready access to the homes of Anti-Slavery parties here, but were invited to the evangelical pulpits of the metropolis, and welcomed to all the privileges of church fellowship. Did the Anti-Slavery Society remonstrate against this? Did Mr. SCOBLE, as the Secretary of that body, write to the metropolitan ministers to have no fellowship with these pro-slavery divines? If so, we can only say that we are in ignorance of the fact, and shall feel most happy in allowing him to rectify an impresson through the medium of our columns, which we know to be shared by the public.

We attach no importance whatever to abstract resolutions, however excellent they may be in themselves, when unaccompanied by corresponding action. We have seen how futile the "resolutions," and "protests," and "respectful suggestions" of the New Broad Street body have been. They have been wholly inoperative. Not one pro-slavery minister, or member of a church on the other side of the Atlantic, has, we will venture to say, been induced to give up his pro-slavery predilections, or abandon his pro-slavery practices, in consequence of those "resolutions," "protests," and "respectful suggestions." Can Mr. SCOBLE name an instance in which this has been done? We know of none, although we have made every inquiry to see whether any such instance could be found.

Ought it not, then, to have occurred to the Anti-Slavery Society long before now, that in not adopting some more energetic course of action, they were betraying the cause for which they were the self-constituted guardians? If the New Broad street Committee have no other course to propose than that which they have hitherto followed, it is obvious that, so far as they are concerned, the doom of American Slavery will be indefinitely postponed.

But we would have felt disposed to make all reasonable allowances for the past dereliction of duty on the part of the Anti-Slavery Society, of which we complain, if even now they had satisfied us, that they had resolved on the adoption of a more vigorous course. Had they only adopted, at the Exeter-hall meeting, of Monday, the course which we have been so long recommending, we should have been willing to look with a lenient eye on the past. What that course of action was, our readers well know. And so do the Anti-Slavery Society, for we took care that copies of our paper of Saturday and Monday, pointing out and enforcing that course, should be forwarded to New Broad street. What we recommended was, that resolutions should be brought forward at the great gathering of the friends of the American slave, in Exeter Hall, pledging all present to exclude pro-slavery transatlantic ministers from the pulpits of England—to refuse to American laymen implicated in the guilt of Slavery, the right hand of Christian fellowship,—and resolutely and unceremoniously to shut the doors of our houses, against either ministers or laymen, whose garments are stained with the blood of the slave.

Such resolutions would have been unanimously carried amidst deafening applause. And they would have produced a tremendous sensation on the other side of the Atlantic. Such denunciations of American Slavery, uttered by an assemblage of 4,000 persons, would have found an echo in every honest and humane bosom in England. They would have created consternation and dismay among the slaveowners and abettors of Slavery, in the United States. But that glorious opportunity of striking at the foundations of the hideous system, has been lost through the want of judgment or faithfulness of the Anti-Slavery Society. That which would have proved so potential and successful a demonstration against the enormities of American Slavery, has gone off, without producing any beneficial results.

We may further ask Mr. SCOBLE, how can he reconcile the fact of the Anti-Slavery Society having had no public meeting for some years, with the duties and obligations of that body, to the Anti-Slavery cause? Is it not matter of unhappy notoriety that the Anti-Slavery Society has been profoundly asleep for some years past?—so much so that some persons could hardly tell whether it was still in existence or not. It will not do to tell us, that the Broad street Society has been inactive, and almost extinct, because the Anti-Slavery feeling in England had died away. That feeling never was dead. It never ran any risk of expiring, provied the requisite means were employed to keep it alive. To do this, was the province of the Anti-Slavery Society. Had that body been as zealous, active, and energetic as it ought to have been, the Anti-Slavery feeling would have been stronger and more general in this country, at this moment, than at any former period of our history. The passing of the iniquitous and inhuman Fugitive Slave Law, would have fed and fanned the Anti-Slavery flame in England, until it had acquired such dimensions, and such an intensity, as would have caused its consuming power to be felt throughout the length and breadth of the Southern States of America. But the Anti-Slavery Society allowed that atrocious measure to become the law of the United States, without adopting any course of action whatever on the subject.

But, as we said in a previous article, let not the poor unhappy slaves of America despair. There is a deep, and still deepening, feeling in this country in their favour, a wide-spread, and still rapidly extending, sympathy in their behalf, which can not be much longer repressed. It will find vent. It will be uttered not in mere words alone, but in a course of action which will soon make itself felt on the other side of the Atlantic. It shall not be our fault if those feelings fail to find the means of effectual utterance. The blame will not rest with us, if such a course of action be not adopted in England, as shall speedily bring the hated edifice of trans-Atlantic Slavery, in ruins about the ears of its criminal supporters.—*Ibid, 25th July.*

---

### THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

#### OPINION OF CHIEF JUSTICE HORNBLOWER.

THE following is the opinion of the distinguished Chief Justice of New Jersey, an extract from which was quoted at a late political convention in Ohio, and reported in our columns. Though it was given fifteen years ago, we are happy to say that its opinions continue to be the opinions of its venerable author, while the argument is as impregnable and unchangeable as the everlasting principles of truth and justice.

New Jersey Superior Court....February Term, 1850.

*The State vs. the Sheriff of Burlington.*—In Habeas Corpus: in the case of Nathan, al. dict.: Alex. Helmsly, a coloured man.

Upon application in behalf of the prisoner, the writ of Habeas Corpus was allowed by the Chief Justice, returnable at chambers. When the prisoner was brought up, the case presenting some difficulties, the Chief Justice remanded the prisoner, with instructions to the Sheriff to have him, together with the cause of his caption and detention, at the bar of this court on the first day of this term.

By the Sheriff's return, it appears that the prisoner had been arrested on a warrant issued by Judge Hayward, of the county of Burlington, and committed to the common jail of said county at the instance of one Willoughby, acting as the agent of a man by the name of ——, in the State of Maryland, and who, as executor of a deceased person, claimed the prisoner as a runaway slave.

The case was argued by Mr. W. Halsted and by Mr. Frelinghuysen in behalf of the prisoner, and by Mr. Clark and Mr. Brown for the claimant.

The Judges delivered opinions *seriatim*: all, however, concurring in discharging the prisoner out of the custody of the Sheriff.

HORNBLOWER, Ch. Just.—By the 3d clause of the 2d sect. of the 4th art. of the Constitution of the United States, it is declared that "No person held to service or labour in one State under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labour may be due."

Upon this subject, both the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of this State have undertaken to legislate, and have passed conflicting laws in regard to it, not indeed in direct opposition to each other, but nevertheless conflicting, because dissimilar laws. They prescribe different modes of proceeding, and seek to enforce them by different sanction. Both cannot be pursued at one and the same time, and one only, I apprehend, must be paramount.

By the 3d sect. of an act of Congress passed the 12th of February, 1793, entitled "An act respecting fugitives from Justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters, it is enacted that the person to whom such service or labour may be due, his agent or attorney may seize or arrest such fugitive (without proof or warrant), and take him or her before any Judge of the Circuit or District Court of the United States or before any magistrate of a county, city, or town corporate, wherein such seizure or arrest shall be made, and upon proof to the satisfaction of such judge or magistrate, either by oral testimony or affidavit, taken before, and certified by, a magistrate of any such State or Territory that the person so seized or arrested doth, under the laws of the State or territory from which he or she fled, owe service or labour to the person claiming him, when it shall be the duty of the judge or magistrate to give a certificate thereof to such claimant, his agent or attorney, which shall be a sufficient warrant for removing the said fugitive from labour to the State or Territory from which he or she fled.

This, it must be admitted, is a summary and dangerous proceeding, and affords but little protection or security to the free coloured man, who may be falsely claimed as a fugitive from labour, or whose identity may be mistaken.

The provisions of the act of this State (Harr. comp. 146) are more humane, and better calculated to prevent frauds and oppression. But the question arises, which shall prevail, the act of Congress, or the law of this State?

By the second clause of the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, it is declared that the constitution and the laws of the United States, "*made in pursuance thereof*," shall be the SUPREME law of the land, and that the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, "any thing in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." If then, Congress has a right to legislate on this subject, the act of Congress must prevail, and the statute of New Jersey is no better than a dead letter. They cannot both be the SUPREME law of the land and constitute the rule of action in one and the same matter. The judges of this State are bound by the act of Congress, any thing in the constitution or law of this State to the contrary notwithstanding. If both acts were precisely the same in all their provisions and sanctions, yet a proceeding in conformity therewith would derive all its authority from the act of Congress and not from the law of this State. But the provisions of the two statutes are very dissimilar, and as the proceedings in this case profess to be in pursuance of the act of this State, it follows, of course, upon the supposition that Congress has a right to legislate in the matter, that the prisoner has been unlawfully committed and ought to be discharged out of the custody of the Sheriff. Upon this ground I might refrain from all further discussion, and render my judgment at once, but then I should be understood as fully admitting the right of Congress to legislate upon the subject, an admission I am by no means prepared to make, any more than I am to express a contrary opinion. I intend only to assign the reasons why I do not at once admit the supremacy of the act of Congress, reserving to myself the right of forming and expressing a final decision hereafter, if in this or any other case such decision shall become necessary.

The 1st and 2d sections of the 4th article of the Constitution of the United States are declarative of certain international principles, agreed upon between the parties to that instrument: 1st. That full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records and judicial proceedings of every other State. 2dly. That the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States. 3dly. That persons fleeing from justice, and found in another State, shall be delivered up, &c. And 4thly. That persons held to labour or service in one State, and escaping into another, shall be surrendered to the party to whom such labour or service is due. By adopting the constitution, the several States became bound to carry out in practice these several constitutional principles; but whether the manner of doing so is to be regulated by State legislation, or by general acts of Congress, is the question. The framers of the constitution thought proper (and it is to be supposed that they did so for some sufficient reason) to arrange the four particulars above mentioned under two distinct sections. By the 1st, it is provided that full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, &c., of every other State. But it does not stop here; if it did, this provision would stand in the same catagory with those contained in the next section, and there would seem to have been no reason for the distribution of these principles into distinct sections. But it is added: "And the Congress *may*, by general laws, prescribe the *manner* in which said acts, &c., shall be proved, and the effect thereof." Then follows the 2d section, embracing the other three principles above mentioned, but *without* annexing to them, or to either of them, the right of legislation by the general government. Hence there seems to arise a fair argument that the framers of the constitution had no idea that the simple statement of these several international stipulations, would confer on Congress any legislative powers concerning them, but as they designed to subject the first particular to the control and regulation of the general government, they arranged it under a distinct section, and in express terms annexed to it the power of legislation, and then threw the other three stipulations together in another section of the instrument, without saying anything more, because no such power was intended to be given to Congress respecting them. A different construction would expose the authors of the constitution to the charge of encumbering it with a useless provision, worse indeed than useless, because, if simply writing down and adopting the several conventional principles comprehended in the second section, carried along with them a right in the general government to provide by law for the manner in which they should be executed, the express grant of such a power in the preceding section was not only useless, but calculated to create doubt and uncertainty as to the right of Congress to legislate on matters contained in the second section. For if the power of legislation is impliedly annexed to the simple stipulations of the second section, it is difficult to perceive why the same implication would not have arisen upon the simple declaration that full faith and credit should be given to the public acts of one State, in the courts of every other State. That the constitution has in express terms given the right of legislation to Congress in reference to one of the four conventional items above mentioned, and remained silent in respect to the others, is to my mind a strong argument that no such power was intended to be given in connection with them.

Again. Are there not sound political as well as judicial reasons, for granting to Congress the power of legislation in the one case, and withholding it in the others? No one State could prescribe the manner in which its own public acts, records and judicial proceedings should be proved in the courts of another State. The rule of evidence is *lexi loci* and every court might have required a different mode of proof. This would have been very inconvenient. It was desirable, therefore, that there should be one uniform rule throughout the country on that subject. But the manner and form in which public acts and records should be exemplified, was a matter about which Congress might safely legislate without discomposing the pride and complacency of State sovereignty, and without the danger of coming into conflict with State institutions and local jurisprudence. Not so in respect to the other stipulations. Legislation by Congress regulating the manner in which a citizen of one State should be secured and protected in the enjoyment of his citizenship in another, would cover a broad field, and lead to the most unhappy results. So, too, general acts, of Congress prescribing by what persons or officers, with or without process, refugees from justice, or persons escaping from labour may be seized or arrested in one State, and forcibly carried into another, can hardly fail to bring the general government into conflict with the State authories, and the prejudices of local communities. Such to some extent has already been the case in this and other States. A constructive power of legislation in Congress is not a favourite doctrine of the present day. By a large portion of the country, the right of Congress to legislate on the subject of Slavery at all, even in the district and territories over which it has exclusive jurisdiction, is denied, and surely by such it will not be insisted that Congress has a construc tive right to prescribe the manner in which persons residing in the free States, shall be arrested, imprisoned, delived up, and transferred from one State to another, simply because they are claimed as slaves.

In short, if the power of legislation upon this subject, is not given to Congress in the 2d section of the 4th article of the constitution, it cannot, I think, be found in that instrument. The last clause of the 8th section of the 1st article, gives to Congress a right to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution all the *powers* vested by the constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or office thereof. But the provisions of the 2d section of the 4th article of the constitution covers no grant to, confides no trust, and vests no *powers* in the government of the United States. The language of the whole office of that section is to establish certain principles and rules of action, by which the contracting parties are to be governed in certain specified cases. The stipulations respecting the rights of citizenship, and the delivery of persons fleeing from justice, or escaping from bondage, are not grants of power to the general government, to be executed by it, in derogation of State authority: but they are in the nature of treaty stipulations, resting for their fulfilment upon the enlightened patriotism and good faith of the several States. The argument in favour of Congressional legislation, founded on the suggestion that some of the States might refuse a compliance with these constitutional provisions, or neglect to pass any laws to carry them into effect, is entitled to no weight. Such refusal would amount to a violation of the national compact and is not to be presumed or anticipated. The same argument, carried out in its results, would invest the general government with almost unlimited power, and extend its constructive rights far beyond any thing that has ever been contended for. The American people would not long submit to a course of legislation by Congress founded on no better authority than the unjust assumption that the States, if left to themselves, would not in good faith carry into effect the provisions of the constitution.

But as I have said before, it is not my intention to express any definite opinion on the validity of the act of Congress, nor is it necessary to do so in this case, as the proceeding in question has not been in conformity with the provisions of that act, but in pursuance of the law of this State. The counsel for the prisoner have insisted upon his enlargement, on the ground that his arrest and commitment were irregular, and unauthorized by the statute. But a preliminary, and to my mind, a very grave and important question arises. Admitting the right of State legislation on this subject (which I am not disposed to deny,) is the law of this State a constitutional one! It authorizes the seizure and transfer out of this State, of persons residing here, under the protection of our laws, claiming to be, and who in fact may be, free-born native inhabitants, the owners of property, and the fathers of families, upon a summary hearing before a single judge, without the intervention of a jury, and without appeal! Can such be a constitutional law? Neither the prisoner at the bar, nor the most wretched and obscure individual in the state, whether young or old, bond or free can be deprived of his liberty or his property, or be subjected to any forfeitures, pains or penalties, without a trial by jury in the due course of law. If the prisoner at the bar, instead of being arrested as a slave, had been sued for forty shillings, it could not have been recovered of him, but by a verdict of a jury. If a man had come from another State and laid claim to any chattel in the possession of the prisoner, he could not have taken it from him, but by due course of law. And yet, by this act, a man may be compelled to join issue before a single judge —a judge of his adversary's own choosing, and in a summary way not according to the course of common law—an issue, it may be, more awful, more agonizing to his soul, than one involving his *life* and *death*—an issue, on the decision of which hangs that tremendous question, whether he is to be separated forcibly and for ever, from his wife and children, or be permitted to enjoy with them the liberty he inherited, and the property he has earned. Whether he is to be dragged in chains to a distant land, and doomed to perpetual Slavery, or continue to breathe the air and enjoy the blessings of freedom. An issue, not only involving the question whether he ever was a slave, or, if once a slave, whether he was liberated, or actually fled from his master; but, it may be, involving the identity of his person. He may be falsely accused of escaping from his master, or he may be claimed by mistake for one who has actually fled. These are questions of fact, upon proof or failure of proof of which, depend results of deep and aff

9 Wend: p. 212). Here is to be an official act – the demand is made by the public authorities, founded simply upon a *charge* of crime.

The accused is to be delivered up, not to be punished, not to be detained for life, but to be *tried*, and if acquitted, to be set at liberty. Not so in the matter under consideration. The person claimed is not to be delivered up *unless* he was "held to labour or service" in another state; that is unless he was *lawfully* held to service or labour there; nor *unless* he has *fled* or *escaped* into this State; that is, come into this State without the consent of his owner. And he is delivered up, not to the *claimant*, but only to the person "to whom such labour or service is due."—Here then are facts to be ascertained, not to be taken for granted, but to be lawfully proved and judicially determined; facts which lie at the foundation of the claimant's right; facts which involve the dearest rights of a human being, and which the claimant must establish according to law, before he can acquire any right to carry away his victim.—And what legislator, under our constitution, has a right to say that these facts shall be tried and definitely settled in a summary manner, and without the verdict of a jury? The Constitution of the United States does not require any such departure from first principles. It only demands that we shall deliver up to his owner *a runaway slave*, when he has been proved to be such in due course of law. It does not require us to do it without proof, nor upon less or different proof than such as would be sufficient to establish any other issuable fact in our courts of justice.

A case has been cited fron 5 Searg & Rawl 62, in which it is said that the court of Pennsylvania decided, that it would not review the proceedings before the inferior magistrate, because the Constitution of the United States requires the *slave* to be given up; and when it was urged that whether *slave* or *not slave* is a question to be settled *here*, the answer borrowed from that case was, that no injustice would be done to the prisoner, because he can assert his freedom in the place to which he may be transported, and we are bound to presume that he will there have a fair trial. So long as I sit upon this bench, I never can nor I never will yield to such a doctrine. What, first transport a man out of the State on the charge of his being a slave, and try the truth of the allegation afterwards—separate him from the place, it may be, of his nativity—the abode of his relatives, his friends, and his witnesses—transport him in chains to Missouri or Arkansas, with the cold comfort that if a freeman he may there assert and establish his freedom! No, if a person comes into this State, and *here* claims the servitude of a human being, whether white or black, *here* he must prove his case, and here prove it according to law, and if our legislature have a right to create and regulate a tribunal before whom such proof is to be made, this court, unless restrained by the same authority, have a right and are solemnly bound to review and correct its proceedings.

But without pronouncing a settled opinion that the act of this State is unconstitutional on the ground that it doprives the accused of a trial by jury, it remains to be considered whether the provisions of she statute have been complied with.

---

The remainder of the opinion is occupied in shewing, that the proceedings under the statue of New Jersey were irregular, and that the prisoner was entitled to his discharge. It is interesting to observe, that the doctrine maintained by the Chief Justice, that the Constitution gives no power to Congress to legislate respecting fugitive slaves, but imposes the obligation of surrendering them on the State authorities, is most fully supported by so distinguished an expounder of the Constitution as Mr. Webster. In his speech of 7th March, 1850, he thus frankly and boldly expressed himself:

"I have always thought that the constitution addressed itself to the legislatures of the States themselves, or to the States themselves. It says that those persons escaping into other States shall be delivered up, and I confess I have always been of opinion that that was an injunction upon the States themselves. It is said that a person escaping into another State, and coming therefore within the jurisdiction of the State, shall be delivered up.

"It seems to me that the plain import of this passage is, that the State itself, in obedience to the injunction, shall cause him to be delivered up. This is my judgment. I have always entertained it, and I ENTERTAIN IT NOW."

Of course, if this "judgment" be correct, the acts of 1793 and 1850 are both unconstitutional. Mr. Webster submits, indeed, to the decision of the Supreme Court, but, notwithstanding that decision, his judgment, he tells us, remains unchanged. One would think others might be permitted, without insult, to hold the same judgment with himself, but it seems not. In his letter to the New York Union-Saving Committee of October, 1850, he says of the Fugitive law—'I have heard no man whose opinion is worth regarding, deny its constitutionality;' and in his Albany speech, last May, he was pleased to tell the crowd—"You can't find a man in the profession in New York, whose income reaches thirty pounds a year, who will stake his professional reputation against it."

The Chief Justice's judgment on the want of constitutional power in Congress to pass the Fugitive law, like Mr. Webster's, remains unchanged; but the following lines from a letter recently addressed by him to a gentleman in New York, shows that, unlike Mr. Webster, he freely permit others to hold the same judgment with himself:

"Be assured, my dear sir, my judgment, whatever "it may be worth, has been for years, and now is, in "perfect accordance with yours, in relation to the un- "constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave laws of 1793 "and 1850. The enactment of those laws, and the "fierce and unforgiving temper in which they are jus- "tified by 'strict constructionists,' who can find no "authority in the constitution to create a national cur- "rency, to protect American industry, or to improve "internal navigation and harbours, illustrate the mel- "ancholy fact, that among men, interest, imaginary or "real, pecuniary or political, too often controls the "judgment and overrules every principle of virtue, "integrity, humanity, and the plainest precepts of "Christian morality."—*Evening Post.*

## *GEORGE THOMPSON AND HIS CONSTITUENTS.*

LONDON, July 16, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR:

In my last letter, I ventured to express a firm conviction, that, notwithstanding all the 'political capital' endeavoured to be made by Mr. Thompson's opponents out of his protracted stay in the United States, an appeal to his constituents, from end to end of the vast borough he represents, would procure him an universal and honourable acquittal, and, moreover, notwithstanding the obloquy which has been attempted to be cast upon his mission on your side of the water, a complete endorsement of his sentiments and acts in reference to American Slavery. The first test of the feeling of the Tower Hamlets has already been made, and has fully realized my expectations. No doubt there was at one time considerable dissatisfaction at our friend's lengthened absence manifesting itself in some degree in the minds of those selfish politicians, who can imagine no Slavery but that of being debarred from going up to the ballot-box, but most extensively arising from the extreme partiality that is felt for Mr. Thompson by the people of the Tower Hamlets, and the consequent reaction at the temporary loss of a man they love so well, as the prevalent notion in their minds, that, to the exclusion almost of the claims of the whole world beside, he is *their* peculiar and special property. The high value which they attach to the services of their honoured representative has led them almost to deprive him of his free will, and unconsciously reduced him, in their estimation, to the condition of a political chattel personal. His return has changed their anger into joy: it has revived the dormant enthusiasm in his favour.

As in most lovers' quarrels, the great sin charged upon Mr. Thompson by his heretofore deserted and disconsolate constituents, has been his neglect to write. 'It was cruel and shameful for you not to have sent some tidings of your welfare—some token of your remembrance,' said they. 'It was indeed,' he penitently replied; and forthwith they hugged him to their bosoms.

Whatever difference of opinion may exist among the inhabitants of the Tower Hamlets as to the degree of damage they have sustained by their Member's absence, there is but one view taken by them of the hideous character of American Slavery, and of the noble efforts of their representative to aid in the destrucion of the system. Let Anti-Slavery be submitted, together with a dozen other questions of what are called 'home interests,' to a poll among the half-million inhabitants of this borough, and upon no subject would there be such general and perfect agreement as upon that of the criminality of American Slavery. You will perceive that the resolution of welcome unanimously passed upon this occasion is of the most thorough Anti-Slavery character. A committee has been appointed to hold what you would call 'mass meetings' throughout the Tower Hamlets, at which Mr. Thompson met his constituents, the particulars of which meetings, at least, if not full reports, I hope to furnish you.

You will be gratified to learn, that the greeting he has met with in the House of Commons has been as cordial as that given him by his constituents. Our most eminent statesmen, and the great leaders of our political parties have heartily welcomed him back within the walls of St. Stephen's; and although he may have in the British Legislature strong political opponents, it is clear that they are nevertheless his warm personal friends. Who, indeed, that comes much in contact with him, can be otherwise?

Immediately upon Mr. Thompson's arrival in the British Metropolis, he published in the leading journals the following letter:

'SIR—Permit me, through the columns of your journal, to take the earliest opportunity and the most efficient means of announcing to the electors and non-electors of the Tower Hamlets, that I yesterday reached London, after an absence of eight months in the United States and Canada.

My stay abroad having been protracted much beyond the brief period which I had assigned for my visit, I have been prevented thus far from attending the sittings of Parliament during the present session.

Having returned to my duties in the House of Commons, I am most anxious to meet my constituents, that I may fully explain to them the circumstances in which I have been placed, and the course which I have thought it right in these circumstances to pursue. This I will do either at an aggregate meeting, or in district meetings, as may be deemed most advisable.

On the shores of a distant country, and amongst a great and free people, I have been the humble but sincere advocate of the principles on which I was elected to Parliament. I return more ardently than ever the devoted friend of progress, and of peaceable and wholesome reform; and whether the reasons I shall be able to give be held sufficient to justify a temporary suspension of my duties at home, or not, I shall not be the less zealous in that cause, nor less solicitous to advance the just rights and interests of that great constituency, through whose independent votes and exertions I was elected to the honorable position which I at present occupy.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
GEO. THOMPSON.

House of Commons,
Tuesday evening, July 8, 1851.

The first step taken consequent upon this letter to bring the honourable gentleman before his constituents, was the summoning the leading men from the various districts of the Tower Hamlets to a preliminary meeting at the Whittington Club, of which highly important and influential institution Mr. Thompson is a Vice President, and Wm. Wells Brown an honourary member. A numerous company was, in compliance with this summons, gathered together on Tuesday evening last, including Sir Joshua Walmsley, M. P., John Williams, Esq., M. P., T. C. Serle, Dennis McDonnell, Thomas McEuteer, S. P. Ward, Esqs., (Members of the Council of the National Reform Association,) F Clarke, P. Crellin, and the most active and influential gentlemen from every portion of the borough represented by Mr. Thompson.

Frederick Clarke, Esq., (a gentleman of high commercial standing, and a deacon of Dr. Campbell's church,) having been called to the Chair, observed, that the present meeting partook rather of the nature of a private meeting; but large public gatherings were intended to be held, at which their noble and excellent friend, George Thompson, whom they all rejoiced to see back again, [prolonged and enthusiastic cheering,] would have an opportunity of stating what he had been doing for the cause of humanity in a distant part of the world [hear]. What had been the loss of the Tower Hamlets had no doubt been the gain of the world. The people of that borough might have felt his absence in a great measure; but let them cherish that large heart which would lead them to bear a little loss to themselves, in order that the cause of humanity might be benefitted in a large degree, as no doubt it had been, by the noble efforts and unrivalled talent of their honourable member, who would presently tell them of the risks he had run, the battles he had fought, and he (the Chairman) hoped the victories he had won [hear]. He could not have laboured for so many months in America without achieving great good; and if he could not see the immediate fruit, yet he had been sowing such seed as must ultimately root out the great curse of that country—Slavery.

MR. THOMPSON (who was received with loud applause) then addressed the meeting, and gave a full explanation of his proceedings in the United States, the position of the Anti-Slavery cause in that country, and the prospects of its ultimate triumph.

A general but interesting conversation then took place respecting the causes which had operated to prolong Mr. Thompson's stay in America, and his future intentions in regard to the Tower Hamlets, in which conversation the theme of universal reprobation was the peculiar institution of the United States.

S. D. SKILLETT, Esq., moved the following resolution:

"That this meeting offers to George Thompson its congratulations on his safe return from his arduous and perilous mission in the United States, and would also record its warm commendation of the heroic and successful contest which, for a period of eight months, he unceasingly waged for the maintenance of the right of free speech in the advocacy of the claims of 3,200,000 slaves, and of 600,000 free, but proscribed, persecuted coloured citizens; that this meeting has listened with deep satisfaction to the statement now made respecting the progress and partial triumphs of the principles of true and impartial freedom in the United States, and fervently hopes that the speedy prevalence of those principles will banish from the continent of America, and from the midst of a great people, the institutions and practices which have, hitherto covered a large portion of the human family—have brought reproach upon the political professions of the people of the United States—and have been greatly injurious to the cause of Democracy throughout the world.

JAMES MURRAY, Esq., in seconding the resolution, stated that at the election in 1847, he had been one of the most active of Mr. Thompson's opponents, having, in fact, been Secretary to the Committee of his antagonist, Col. Fox; but subsequent observation of Mr. Tompson's public conduct had determined him (Mr. Murray) upon any future occasion to give that honourable gentleman his warm and hearty support (cheers).

MR. THOMPSON said that in proof of the extraordinary pressure which had been brought to bear upon his time and physical and mental endurance in America, he might refer to the testimony of Mr William Lloyd Garrison, contained in a letter written by that truly noble man (loud cheers) to Mrs. Thompson; that letter had never been seen by him (Mr. Thompson), but Mr. Farmer had a copy of it with him, which he would probably read.

MR. FARMER then read the following extract of the letter referred to: 'Of course, you must have derived from the *Liberator* and the *Standard* some idea of the number of the meetings he has been called to address, and the immense amount of labour that has been thrown upon him here. Suffice it to say, that his time has been completely devoured by the friendly intercessions or importunate solicitations of a great and increasing multitude, ever anxious to see and hear him. Indeed, you cannot form an adequate conception of the pressure which has been brought to bear upon him, almost without a moment's relaxation. Never has he spent six months so busily or labouriously. Applications for his presence and labours have been multiplied to an overpowering extent, and, in his kindness of heart and great anxiety to gratify his friendly applicants, he has yielded to an extent that has seriously perilled his health. Undoubtedly he has been in great personal danger from the vindictiveness of the unrelenting enemies of the Anti-Slavery cause, but certainly even in more danger (in a different shape) from the importunity of his numerous friends. He has almost reason to exclaim, 'Save me from my friends, and I will take care of my enemies.' Nothing, it seems to me, could be more opportune than his visit to this country. It has fairly electrified the land. It has enabled us to determine with mathematical accuracy what is the state of the nation, and how far the sacred cause of negro emancipation has advanced since he was here in 1835. In only two instances has he been rudely treated—once in this city and once in Springfield, an inland town in this State. In hundreds of other instances, he has been favourably received, candidly listened to, and cordially welcomed, beyond our most sanguine expectations. The fruits of his labours cannot fail to be abundant. Various circumstances have conspired to protract his visit much longer than he intended to be absent when he left home. In view of them, it is my positive conviction, that he could not have returned at an earlier period to his family with advantage to himself or to the Anti-Slavery cause. It has been necessary for him to maintain his right to be heard in this country, and to avoid the appearance of a cowardly flight from it in view of the foul attacks upon him in the public press, and the efforts of such men as Clay, Webster and Cass, to have him silenced.'

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously amidst much cheering, and the meeting resolved itself into a Committee for the arrangement of large public meetings throughout the borough, at which Mr. Thompson may address his constituents.

The above is a very brief outline of such portions of the proceedings as may be interesting to the readers of the *Liberator*. I have reason to know that, since his return, Mr. Thompson's political integrity has been tested in a powerful manner. Had he chosen to resign his seat, he might have put thousands of pounds into his pocket as a consideration for the act. But his answer was such as those who know him would have been certain he would give—'*No*; whatever may be my poverty, I will never sell my constituents.'

We are now endeavouring to carry out a plan, which, if successful, will be a good Anti-Slavery demonstration in the British metropolis—a Soirée to be given to Mr. Thompson, upon the 1st of August next, by the Fugitive Slaves now in England, of whom there are about twenty-five at present. Mr. Thompson will speak at the Peace Congress next week. I hope to send you a report of his speech.

I am, my dear sir, yours, very truly,
W. FARMER.

W. L. Garrison, Esq.

## *TRIUMPHANT RECEPTION OF GEORGE THOMPSON BY HIS CONSTITUENTS.*

*Public Endorsement of the Principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society by the People of the Tower Hamlets.*

LONDON, July 25, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR:

The appeal which was recently made by the American Anti-Slavery Society to the Constituency of the Tower Hamlets, in justification of the prolonged absence of their esteemed member in the United States, has been nobly met by them, at two of the largest and most influential meetings that have ever been convened within that district. The 500,000 people represented by Mr. Thompson have admitted the validity of the plea sent over by the American Abolitionists in his behalf; and notwithstanding the cuckoo cry of the pro-slavery party in England and America, that he would never come in again as member from that bourough, the men of the Tower Hamlets, in public meeting assembled, have unanimously resolved at any future election to return George Thompson as their honoured representative. That which seemed a hindrance has turned out rather to the furtherance of the cause. The opposition has had the effect of placing Mr. Thompson in a proud and elevated position which no other man in the House of Commons can boast of. He has been virtually re-elected by his constituency. His prolonged visit to the United States was seized upon by a certain clique of the mercantile aristocracy within that borough, who have long been desirous of obtaining the representation for men of their own class, and they sought to make political capital for themselves by industriously disseminating charges of dereliction of Parliamentary duty against the man of the people. Mr. Thompson has most completely cut the ground from beneath his adversaries, by voluntarily summoning his constituents to meet him, and by placing, although not technically yet really, in their hands, the trust which they had reposed in him in 1847. That constituency ignored the charges. They declared that he was more usefully engaged for the cause of universal liberty, in his Anti-Slavery mission in America, than he would have been in England by raising his voice within the walls, or going out with small minorities into the lobby, of the House of Commons. Instead of censuring him for his abolition labours with you, they have unequivocally and emphatically endorsed his Anti-Slavery principles, and sent him back into the British legislature, reinvested with the highest dignity they could possibly confer upon him, that of the representative of the largest borough constituency in the whole kingdom; and if ever a man has a right to be proud of the enthusiastic personal love and unbounded political confidence of the hundreds of thousands of whom he is the chosen representative, that man is GEORGE THOMPSON. The pit which his enemies had digged for him, they have fallen into themselves. Nothing could have been more advantageous to Mr. Thompson than the *coming out* of these men. They were doing a certain amount of mischief in secret; but having ventured to show themselves, their power has been completely crushed. Haman now hangs upon a gibbet fifty cubits high; while GEORGE THOMPSON rides forth triumphantly as the man whom, above and beyond all others, the people delight to honour.

There are many causes of gratulation at this decision of the Tower Hamlets. I rejoice in it as an act of justice to Mr. Thompson himself. I rejoice in it as an evidence of the magnanimity of the people he represents, who, although having suffered locally by his absence, have cheerfully consented to the sacrifice for the cause of humanity, thereby proving themselves to be a constituency worthy of such a representative. The Tower Hamlets made the most valuable contribution they had it in their power to give to the American A. S. Society, in lending them, by distinct resolution, their own George Thompson. The Tower Hamlets, by specific vote, have now approved of the unexpectedly extended use the American abolitionists have made of him. I rejoice at the decision, because it is a plain and open endorsement of the principles of the American Anti-Slavery Society by the largest and most intelligent constituency in the British Empire—a borough, which, notwithsanding the statements made (whether intentionally or unintentionally false, I know not) on your side of the water, of its low and vulgar people, is nevertheless, in fact, the wealthiest district in the whole kingdom, containing a larger amount of property than any two cities upon which the finger could be placed on the American map—a district which, for extent of manufactures, shipping or commerce, cannot be paralled by any city in the American Union—a district which, although it has the restricted name of a 'borough,' a cluster of hamlets, a congeries, not of small villages, but good-sized towns, which, while including a large number of the abodes of the poor, has multitudes not merely of the residences of the middle classes, but the mansions of the London merchant princes—a district with a population of no Red Republican or Socialistic character, but the bulk of whom are that industrious class which form the tone and sinew of British society, whose spiritual pastors are the Coxes, Reeds, Campbells, Smiths, Burders, and others, whose Puritan Orthodoxy no man can question—that borough, I say, has distinctly and emphatically indentified itself in spirit with the American Anti-Slavery Society, for to that alone does Mr. Thompson invariably, in his speeches here, give the glory of the Anti-Slavery movement in the United States. In fact no other Anti-Slavery organization is generally known by the people of this country. The name of William Lloyd Garrison is received in public meetings with enthusiastic demonstrations of applause, while that of Lewis Tappan is never heard in our large assemblies, or his existence known in England beyond the precints of Broad street.

I rejoice at the triumphant reception of Mr. Thompson, also, as a tacit censure of that most contemptible and unchristian spirit of all sections which mingle the way of human progress in this country—money-bag snobbism. We have a class of persons in this city similar in character, I should judge to, your State street cottonocracy. These men, as I have before said, have been most insidiously and industriously working to oust a noble, talented and incorruptible man like him, for being guilty of the unpardonable sin of poverty without pliancy, to send into the House of Commons, instead of a tried, warm-hearted intellectual giant, a cold-blooded lump of mere respectability, with the most infantile mental powers, whose only antecedents are in the counting-house, whose only qualifications is a large banker's balance, and whose only certificate of recommendation is from Mammon. The colleague of Mr. Thompson, Sir William Clay, is a fair representative of this fraction of the electors; but not only have the constituency now given Mr. Thompson their pledge to return him at any future election, but also to cure the present *mesalliance*, and furnish him with a colleague who shall not be a mere representative of the little body which arrogates to itself a monopoly of the respectability of the borough.

I rejoice in these unanimous votes of praise and confidence, because they administer a deserved rebuke to the ministerial insolence of Lord John Russel, who had the impertinance to taunt the honourable member for the Tower Hamlets with his prolonged absence in America—an act both unjust and ungentlemanly, and which can only find the semblance of palliation in the fact that he had just been skinned by Mr Thompson for his tergiversation upon the subject of admitting Jews into Parliament.

The two meetings which have been held are part of a series which will take place throughout the Tower Hamlets. The first was held in Shoreditch, the largest district of the borough. There were abuout three thousand persons present. The chair was taken by J.H. Pickford, Esq., the Churchwarden of the Parish, who is also Chairman of the local National Reform Association. A feeble opposition was raised at first, but ultimately the following resolution was carried unanimously, amidst loud and prolonged cheering:

'Resolved, That this meeting having heard the explanatory statement of GEORGE THOMPSON, desire to express their entire satisfaction with that statement, their renewed confidence in his determination to stand by the great principles of political freedom, and their resolution, in the event of a general election, to give him their hearty and unabated support.'

The speech of Mr. Thompson, and a report generally of the proceedings, I will endeavour to send you on a future occasion. The platform was crowded with the most influential men of the district. Upon Mr. Thompson's entering the room, its walls echoed again and again with the enthusiastic plaudits with which he was greeted. At the termination of the proceedings, three times three cheers were given for Mr. Thompson, and three groans were also proposed for the American slaveholders. The local effect of the meeting you may judge of by a letter addressed to myself, as Honorary Secretary to the Thompson Committee, from the Chairman:

13 Wittam's Buildings,
Old Street Road, July 25, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR:

I have much pleasure in forwarding to you a copy of the Resolution which was passed unanimously last Wednesday evening at the large meeting of the inhabitants of the Shoreditch District of the Tower Hamlets.

As I am Chairman of the Shoreditch District of the National Reform Association, and one of the Churchwardens of the Parish, I have good opportunities of judging of the feeling of the electors of all classes, and I am positive that, so far as Shoreditch is concerned if an election were to take place immediately, GEORGE THOMPSON would be returned by an overwhelming majority.

The large room in Cowper street, in which the meeting was held, is stated to hold three thousand persons, and was completely crowded; and the Resolution was passed, without a single hand being held up against it.

I am, dear sir,
Yours, very truly,
J. H. PICKFORD.

To W. Farmer Esq

The second meeting was attended by upwards of 2000 electors and non-electors, and was presided over by one of the oldest and most influential reformers of the District, Dr. Bowkett. The following resolution was also carried, unanimously, amidst the most rapturous applause:

'Resolved, That this meeting cordially approve of the efforts of their Representative, Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON, for the abolition of Slavery in America,—that execrable plague spot which damnifies political institutions that would, otherwise, make the republic of the United States the exemplar of the world:—That they fully sympathize in his protracted and arduous struggles for the elevation and emancipation of their coloured brethren throughout the world:—That they have heard with sincere satisfaction his assurance, that he will henceforth constantly attend to the interests of this large constituency, and hereby pledge themselves to give him their continued confidence, and their utmost support at the next election for the Tower Hamlets.'

(Signed)
THOMAS EDWARD BOWKETT, *Chairman.*

The particulars of this meeting I will also give you upon a future occasion. I know the deep interest you feel on this subject, and I shall not fear, therefore, to burthen you with matter respecting it.

I am, dear sir,
Yours most truly. W. FARMER.
W. L. GARRISON,

---


## National Anti-Slavery Standard.

*** *All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns should be addressed to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

†† *Donations to the Treasury of the* AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY *may be forwarded to* FRANCIS JACKSON, *Treasurer, at Boston; or to* SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, *New-York.*

*NEW YORK, THURSDAY, AUGUST* 14, 1851.


## NO VOTING AND DISUNION.

THERE are two propositions which appear to be axiomatic to almost every free and independent American. The one, that Voting is the Universal Medicine, the Grand Arcanum, which is to cure all political and moral evils. The other, that the Union of these States is an existing fact, as well as that it is the breath of our nostrils, the withdrawal of which would produce National Asphyxia and individual death. When, therefore, a set of men is to be found who refuse to exercise this heaven-born privilege of suffrage, and utterly deny the existence of any Union of the character so much vaunted, and as openly advocate the duty and necessity of repudiating the sham that is palmed upon the people of this Country for the genuine article, it is a hard saying and few there be that can hear it. And yet it does not seem as if either of these propositions were very difficult of comprehension. The one seems to be as plain as any ethical proposition that can be stated, and the other capable of as complete substantiation as any historical fact or political theory resting upon historical facts. As thus.

Why do not the Abolitionists of the type of the American Anti-Slavery Society accept office and vote at the polls? Simply because we have a "prejudice" which we have not yet "conquered," lamentable as our benighted estate may appear to Mr. Daniel Webster, against making promises which we do not mean to keep. We are quite aware that this is a very "unstatesmanlike" infirmity, but it is one to which we confess. We cannot hold an office which must be entered upon with an oath to support the Constitution of the United States (which includes nearly every office, high and low) simply because we don't mean to support it, and therefore have a scruple (a nice and unnecessary one, perhaps) against swearing to do so. We hold that the clause providing for the restoration of persons held to service or labour to the party to whom such service or labour may be due, means the restitution of fugitive slaves to their masters. And as this happens to be one of the things which we are resolute never to do, but, contrariwise, to impede, hinder and prevent to the best of our ability, we do not feel free to swear to do it. Now, we know that there are persons of great respectability and excellence who hold that this clause need not be construed to mean Slaves, and who prove, by verbal niceties and logical distinctions, that there is no comfort or aid intended to be given to Slavery by the Constitution. And some go so far as to say that it can be abolished by Act of Congress, under the Constitution. Without entering into any consideration of this argument at this time, we can only say that we have not been convinced by it; but that we think that the whole contemporary evidence of the intention of the framers, confirmed by the unanimous decisions of all the Courts and the uniform practice and consent of the government and country from the first, shows it was the rendition of fugitives slaves that that clause was contrived to secure. We have, at any rate, the rare luxury of being in the majority, for once; and wrong as we think that majority for being willing to maintain such a Constitution, we think that they are quite right in their construction of it. And so thinking of its meaning, and so intending as to its execution, we do not think it worth our while to swear to do what we mean never to do.

So with respect to the clause for the suppression of Domestic Insurrection, it is certainly meant to include, if it were not framed exclusively to cover, the only Domestic Insurrections which can call for the interposition of the National arm—the Insurrections of Slaves. Now, we hold that, in the presence of the American nation and in the light of its history, Insurrection is at all times a rightful remedy of the slaves, whenever they think that the time has come, in the course of human events, to dissolve the servile bands that connect them with their masters. Therefore, we certainly do not mean, in case of such an incipient Revolution, to help to put it down in order that the tyrants may be re-established in their oppression. We can conceive, scarcely, of any crime more mean and cowardly than such a co-operation with the trembling tyrants to weld again the chains which their victims had broken, by the interposition of our physical force. Not intending, therefore, to obey the call of the Executive, should the exigencies of the nation even make one necessary, to assist in a crusade for Slavery against Liberty struggling into being, we do not intend to promise to do so. The clause, too, protecting the African Slave Trade for twenty years, and under which that much abused branch of commerce may be legalized again at any moment by Act of Congress, we think brands the Constitution with a mark of infamy, sufficiently indicative of its pro-slavery character, and which certainly does not make us swift to acknowledge allegiance to it. And the three-fifths clause, whereby an aristocracy resting on ownership in human beings is established, a power which has ever been, by force or by guile, the governing element in the nation, does not inflame our zeal in the behalf of a Constitution of Government which begins by putting the foot of our natural enemies, of the meanest and most execrable race of tyrants that God suffers to exist, upon our necks in the outset.

But the two first objections are quite enough. If there are certain things specially laid down in Articles of Partnership which we are invited to subscribe, and we find that there are some of those certain things which we do not mean, in any event, to do; it seems to us the fairest, indeed the only honest, way of proceeding to refuse to sign the Articles, and to forego the advantages promised by them. We think that there is good faith due to the other parties to the contract, however bad, and that if we take the consideration, they would have good ground to complain of us, if we do not perform the conditions. If we are asked to partake in a lucrative business, in the benefits of which we can have no part unless we sign the papers creating the partnership, and we find on examination that the African Slave trade, or the Domestic Slave trade, or any other less recognised form of piracy, was among the branches of the contemplated business, we could not enter into the agreement, because it would be false to ourselves to carry it out and unfair to our partners to refuse to do so, if we had made the bargain with them. And by a parity of reasoning we decline appointing others to do these things for us by our suffrages, which we will not do ourselves. We do not agree with the philosophy of the Quaker who applied to Judge Smith, of Exeter, when Governor of New Hampshire for the Shrievalty of Rockingham County. "Why, my friend," said the Governor, "you are not fit to be a Sheriff. Suppose there was a man to be hanged, you would n't do it!" "That's true," replied the applicant, "but then I would appoint a Deputy that *would*." We do not believe in appointing Deputies to do what we think to be wrong for ourselves to do.

But then this impracticability of yours stands directly across the path to success and palsies the very right hand that you should stretch out to help the Slave! In the first place, this is begging the question, taking for granted the very point we deny, to wit, that voting at the polls is the only, or the most efficient, means of political action. But admitting it to be true, can there be any question in the case, if our opinions are what we have affirmed? Though taking office or voting for other men under the Constitution should have the most direct and immediate influence on the Abolition of Slavery, we are not to purchase even so great a boon as that at the expense of doing what we believe to be wrong. We know men who profess to believe that the preservation of the Union by obedience to the Fugitive Slave Law is the best thing that can be done for ultimate Emancipation. But are they therefore excused for taking part in the commission of that infamous crime? Things may be Right which are not Expedient, but nothing can be Expedient that is not Right. It might seem to be the most expedient thing in the world to assassinate Nicholas of Russia, or Francis Joseph of Austria, or the Pope of Rome; but no man holding assassination in abhorrence would consent to the crime for the sake of the consequences. We acknowledge the weight of our duty to the Slave, but it is not the primary, the paramount, duty. The first and highest duty of every man is to himself, to keep himself above all taint, if not above all suspicion. The Slave has a right to demand of us anything except our honour. Our own integrity it is our first duty to maintain. In short, the whole No Voting Theory is simply a question of personal honour, of individual integrity. Whether being faithful to this first trust will be most conducive to the successes of our second trust, the Anti-Slavery movement, we will not affirm, though we believe it with our whole hearts. But the slaves have no right to ask us to pay this price for their deliverance, admitting that it is necessary to it. We may not be more faithful to Man than to God.

These are truisms, but they are truisms that demand repetition. The simplest ideas are often the most difficult to make others understand. We have tried to make our position clear in this particular. At some future time we will expound anew our doctrines in regard to the Union and the Constitution, which are at least as easy to understand, if they are as hard to be received.—E. Q.

## *ENGLISH UNITARIANS ON SLAVERY.*

THE American organs of Unitarianism, the *Register* and *Inquirer* are still as silent as they can be on the earnest remonstrances which the English brethren are offering to those of the faith in this country. The *Register* of last week condescends to give the Resolutions passed at the meeting at Exeter Hall, but we have just so much faith in the impartiality and fairness and independence of that paper as to believe that it publishes these Resolutions because it fears it may give offence to individuals by refusing a place in its columns to a letter of Dr. Hutton's by which they are accompanied. The *Register* dares attempt to smother entirely the voice of English Unitarians on the Slavery question, because for this it does not hold itself responsible to any individual, but it has not the courage to offend any one man of influence who may take it upon himself to ask that some particular expression of opinion shall be made manifest. So it is no unusual thing to see a miscreant who will set at defiance the laws and the rights of the whole community, but who is none the less abject and obedient to any one man who may threaten to cudgel him if he ventures to commit any depredations on his property.

Dr. Hutton's letter the *Register* accompanies with a few words of comment written in a tone both vexed and flippant. It rejoices that the English Unitarians have "so much leisure on their hands" that they can attend to this subject; as if Christians were to fulfil their Christian duty when they have nothing else to do; no customers to wait upon—no goods to sell—no books to post—no worldly matters, in short, of any sort to look after. And then also the *Register* rejoices that its brethren abroad "have hearts large enough to reach even us;" a sneer which would not be worth even a smile in reply, did not the writer, himself, seeing evidently when the words were written, that he was indulging a bitter spirit, adds hypocrisy to that by insisting upon his own satisfaction in this well-meant rebuke. That he has no such satisfaction however, he acknowledges in the same breath by declining the proffered advice inasmuch as we—these American Unitarian divines, to wit,—are "in the midst of the contest," "and are better able to judge of the specific modes of action" suited to this warfare with Slavery!—as it *they* ever did anything but resolutely refuse to have part or lot in this battle which is raging around—though not among—them; and had not always declared that the only "specific mode of action" in this case, was to decline any action whatsoever. If the *Register* really thinks that the members of its society abroad are so stupid as to be blinded to this state of things here, we should hardly so much be surprised at its contemptuous insinuation that the Anti-Slavery sentiment of the English Unitarians is "manufactured" to answer the private ends of some unscrupulous person here.

The letter of Dr. Hutton which calls forth such animadversions from the *Register* we give below:

FAIRFIELD, Glasnevin, Dublin,
July 3d, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—I have great pleasure in transmitting to you the accompanying Resolutions. Most sincerely and deeply do I rejoice in the unanimity of the meeting. It will prove to our American brethren, I trust, that, however we may hesitate to pass judgment upon them, we are united in our opinion of your vile Fugitive Slave Law, and of the sacred duty incumbent upon you of disobedience to its wicked requirements. I have indeed been grieved to learn, what I was not *in the least* prepared to hear, that the American Unitarian Association have determined by a majority not to express any opinion or take any action upon the subject. It only proves to me more clearly what I have long thought, that the tendencies of the voluntary principle, as it is called, (which nevertheless I advocate as accompanied with fewer evils on the whole than the opposite one,) is not unfrequently to make the shepherds unrighteously subservient to the sheep, and to give the latter the choice of the pastures into which the former are to guide, or rather to seem to guide them. I verily believe that the majority of those who, in *America*, hesitate as to their duty with respect to this law, possessing the same knowledge of all the pros and cons, but exempted from the bias of interest and vulgar opinion, would have no hesitation, in *England*. You will say perhaps that in expressing this opinion I am doing the very thing that I cry out against, and judging those who profess to take a different view of duty from myself. But no. In no one individual instance would I venture, without positive evidence, to pronounce upon motives. I merely state a general, and, in my mind, indisputable fact—that "a gift blindeth the eyes"—that interest darkens the judgment—and that men of our profession are as liable as those of any other to a bias. Priests are men. It does not follow, however, that we have authority to say in any single instance—"here the man acted and here the priest." Jesus denounced the Scribes and Pharisees with a generality, which it would perhaps be more becoming in us *not* to imitate,—as hypocrites; but in so doing, I am persuaded he did not mean to stigmatize any unspecified individual. He knew that there was a Paul, and, in all probability, many another honest and true man, amongst the Pharisees. He could see distinctly to what influences the members of a sect or profession were exposed, and would, doubtless, in many cases succumb, and yet his injunction to all those who did not, like himself, "know what was in man," would, I am sure have been "Judge not." You will see, therefore, why I cannot sympathize with many of my friends in America, and with some in England, in their denunciations of *men*; but I do go the *whole* length with my fellow Abolitionists in their denunciations of the Fugitive Slave Law, and of the compromises of the American Constitution, which prepared the way for it, as essentially wicked,—and in their assertion of the sacred duty of labouring for its repeal, and of refusing to obey it, as contrary to the law of God, so long as it remains unrepealed. Of the sentiments thus expressed make what use you please; and believe me to remain, with sincere personal regard, and warm sympathy with you in the great object which you have at heart, my dear sir.

Faithfully yours,
JOSEPH HUTTON.

REV. S. MAY, Jr.

---

## Communications.

### *A NEW LAW FOR THE RETURNING OF FUGITIVE SLAVES.*

MR. EDITOR:—The remarks of the Rev. James Smylie, of Mississippi, respecting the returning of fugitive slaves, recently published in your paper, suggest to my mind the propriety of petitioning Congress for a new law on the subject—a law based on the Epistle of Paul to Philemon. The Rev. J. Smylie argues, that in this Epistle is apostolic authority for returning the fugitive slave to his master's authority, exercised in the return of Onesimus to Philemon. Now, let it be admitted that Onesimus was a slave, which I do not believe: first, because he was an own brother to Philemon—"brother in the *flesh*"; and, second, because he was capable of contracting a debt, which a slave is not. "If he hath wronged thee or *oweth* thee aught." How did Paul proceed? Before he sent Onesimus back, he instructed him in the Christian Religion, till he gave evidence of sincere conversion. Then he gave him a kind letter of introduction to his master, Philemon, recommending him to forgive the wrong of the past, and to treat him "not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, both in the flesh and in the Lord." Paul directs him to receive him as himself; "Receive him as myself." It appears that Philemon had been previously converted to the Christian faith, under Paul's preaching, so that the Apostle regarded him as a true Christian. As Onesimus had also become a Christian, he had no fear about sending him back to his old master, because they would now meet and live together as Christian brethren, in the exercise of mutual love. Onesimus would do as Paul directs servants, obey in all things his master, according to the flesh, not with eye-service, as men pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God—doing whatever he did heart

such with excommunication, without benefit of clergy. Charging us with "sinister efforts" to secure "the patronizing smiles of"—who? Why, the very class he is now making his chief study to please. They that live in glass houses should be careful how they throw stones. And then, too, we are charged with "ingratitude"—to whom? Why, to the *North Star*, which has left its *orb*, to give place to a substitute of doubtful magnitude. Ingratitude! indeed!! What does this pugnacious substitute mean? Does it mean that it is the only planet in the moral universe in existence for *our* special good, and that *we* ought to fall down and worship this new bantling, baptizing it in the name of Smith, of Spooner, and of Webster, the *unholy trinity* of Conscience and the Constitution? If this is the kind of light we are to have from the Vatican at Rochester, the sooner the Pope leaves the chair of Saint Editor, the better; for neither Free Soil bayonets nor Liberty Party cohorts (now reduced to a corporal's guard) will enable His Holiness to hold his seat against the will of his once faithful, but now deserted, vassals.

WILLIAM P. POWELL.

---

POUGHKEEPSIE, July 28, 1851.

FRIEND GAY:

Amid the busy scenes of daily labour, the constant din of the pro-slavery political slang of the Union, the weekly arrival of *The Standard* is refreshing to the heart of a lover of the equality of the races, without respect to their colour or condition in life: such I have professed to be. Your last number of *The Standard* is peculiarly interesting, as it contains all the varied phases of human rights, that have hitherto been presented to us. Your Boston correspondent shows the fact, that the salvation of the Union, after having been in the hands of the Godlike Daniel, and by him and the clergy so often preserved, is now passed into the hands of the common people, and by them saved no less than five or six times in the course of a couple of weeks.—Truly, we live in a wondrous age; everything, but Anti-Slavery, goes by steam—'nations almost born in a day.' I lately saw in a newspaper the remark of the editor, that Mr. Webster, after having made speeches, and saved the Union a number of times, was now making speeches to save himself: it may be so. Your Boston correspondent thinks some people have a *notion* of setting him up for next President; but I hope they will defer it for the present, as I think there is a greater work for him to perform yet than any he has heretofore achieved, of that I will speak hereafter. In the first place, I object to his being brought before the country for its chief magistrate, because he is a northern man; and should he be elected, you know no northern man has a right to be President but one term, after which he must retire to private life—be known no more in the political strifes of the day, and his services be lost to the country and the world. In the next place, there is a vast more important work for some one to perform than the salvation of the Union, as much more so as spiritual is more important than temporal interest. I have no one in my eye at the present so well qualified for that important work, if we may take the success attending his efforts for our standard to judge by. You reccollect that I mentioned before of an important work for him to do yet, but if he should get to be President his services would be wholly lost to this country and the world, and that work perhaps never be accomplished. You know if any compromise is to be concocted, it has always required the services of Mr. Clay; so, if this Union is to be saved, it requires the services of Mr. Webster, and both alike have been equally successful.

You and I, my dear friend, have been taught that the Church was the hope of the world, and far be it from me to deny that assertion. But certainly, if she continues to retain her present pro-slavery position, her influence and standing must be wholly lost. So far as the good she will be able to effect, she is already becoming a stench in the nostrils of the Old World; they feel that she needs saving quite as much as the Union did at the time Mr. Webster stepped forward and saved it. You perhaps will ask me how I would have him save it; I answer, I do not know how, as there is an analogy in the position of Church and State, perhaps analogus remedies may have the desired effect. If the Church can be saved by a complete summersault, who is so well qualified as Mr. Webster for the work?

But to the point: a few days since, an acquaintance of mine, known for his skepticism in matters of religion, called to me on passing him, and said he had just read in a newspaper that the different denominations of Christians in the United States held slaves to the value $400,000,000, asking me if such was the fact. I told him I could not tell, having no statistics at hand for reference, but they held them to a very large amount, probably something near that amount. What kind of Christianity, says he, do you call that that can hold $400,000,000 in slaves? What could I say to such a question? at the risk however of being called Infidel, I answered—spurious!

SAML. THOMPSON.

---

## Foreign Correspondence.

FROM OUR DUBLIN CORRESPONDENT.

DUBLIN, July 25, 1851.

MY DEAR GAY: I don't think I told you in any of my late letters of an episode of our late visit to London. One beautiful summer's evening, after a pleasant day spent at Greenwich, walking the hospital, talking to the old sailors who spend their *otium* (*cum dignitate*, and as much gin as they can get to drink) there; staring at the relics of Nelson and other admirals, and at the Gallery of Pictures of hard actions in which the English are invariably victors; strolling through the town and the park, which is as old as the days of Elizabeth; and mounting to the observatory, where we pleased ourselves that we were at the 0 point of longitude; after eating oranges and reclining on the grass—for we left London to be rural, and there was quite a group of us, of all ages and sexes, boys and girls, and grey hairs, "aged, middle aged, and beloved youth"—after remarking profoundly that, although London was only 6 miles off, we could see nothing for the smoke, and talking of matters that were going on four thousand miles off, for there were some very bigotted Abolitionists in our party—we all returned *to town*, as the gigantic City is familiarly or facetiously called. Strolling leisurely and lazily up Grace Church (always called Gracious) Street, my eyes were arrested by a placard purporting that the following day, "at "half past 6, A. M., an excursion train would start "from the Waterloo Bridge Station, for Salisbury, "giving the tourist an opportunity of visiting the "famous Cathedral of that ancient town, and the cele-"brated Druidical Temple of Stonehenge, the most "wonderful relic of antiquity in the British Islands; "and returning to London from Salisbury at 8 1-2 P. "M." Now, you must know that, from a child, I have longed to visit Stonehenge, but hardly hoped ever to accomplish my desire. Salisbury is 96 miles South-west of London, in a corner of England quite out of the way of any place where I am likely to be seen. We are not such an erratic people as you, who, I suppose, are the most nomadic of all civilized nations. In the Old Country, there are millions of men, not to speak of women and children, whose course through life might be traced upon the map within a very small compass. I have seen grown-up men, and I doubt not there are plenty of them, who had never wandered farther than 7 miles from Dublin. However, when I laid the glories of a day at Salisbury and Stonehenge before our party, they all cheerfully consented, as youthful minded people (whether young or old) generally do when anything particularly agreeable is proposed. Having made our little preparations, and secured the key of the house, that we might let ourselves in the following night without disturbing any body, we went to bed early, and were all up at 5, took a "hasty" crust of bread, and walked, passed St. Paul's, which looked vast, and clear and grand in the morning sun, down Ludgatehill, Fleet Street and the Strand, and over Waterloo Bridge, by which time the mighty canopy of London smoke was spread over the town, and St. Paul's looked wrapped in mist. We reached the Railway Station in time to secure good seats in the open cars, for the double purpose of seeing the country and saving our purses to perfection, for in the covered carriages we should had to pay double, whilst we could not have seen half so much. The morning was fine, and the green grass very pleasant after the crush, turmoil and rush of London. To be sure, we still had plenty of dust as we rushed along at thirty or forty miles an hour through the rich, highly cultivated and level country; for, although I am no geologist, it did not require a Lyell to know that we were passing over the chalk formation. However, it is a long lane (and ours was a very long one) that has no turning, and so, at about half past nine, we reached Salisbury, after having had the light and elegant spire (the highest building in England—it is about four feet higher than St. Paul's) in view for some miles. After our little trip we were all in high condition for breakfast; and then we hired two carriages to take us seven or eight miles to Stonehenge, at a charge per head about equal to the fare from London and back again. The weather, however, was so burning hot, and the road so free from shade or shelter from the glaring sunshine, that we all thought the jaunt good value, and that it would have been a woful Tour in Search of the Picturesque if "wretches such as we" had had to broil for seven miles over such a dry, dusty, flinty, chalky, treeless country as we traversed on that memorable day I remember Salisbury Plain almost as long as I remember any thing. When quite a little fellow, I read, or somebody read for me, Miss Hannah More's obsolete story of The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain, and my imagination was impressed with the idea of a vast, treeless, pathless, level wilderness—a real plain, as flat as a pancake, and here and there a flock of sheep and a solitary shepherd. The particular doctrine preached or practised by the shepherd who was the hero of the story impressed me not at all. I knew nothing of Stonehenge for many years after, but still so long ago that there was no locality in England I so much wished and so little expected to see. My visits to the sister Island (a very proud and a very tyrannical and overbearing sister she has often shown herself) have been almost invariably either for business purposes or to see some people that could be seen on no other terms Stonehenge would wait a century for me if I were to stay so long. But the dear faces, familiar or unfamiliar, pictured or long-imagined, pass rapidly away, and there is no furniture I like so well for the adornment of "my mind's gallery." At last, our driver turned from the high road on to the soft turf, and, after about a mile's driving over the green sward, we reached Stonehenge. It consisted originally of a double circle of upright stones, the outer circle about 14 feet, and the inner one about 5 feet high. The outer stones are very massy and cyclopean in their proportions, and some pairs of them are surmounted by another of similar size, laid across and rudely morticed, so as to form a lofty portal, beneath which you enter the temple. Some of the larger stones are penetrated and partly sunk by their great weight in the earth. None of them are very deep in the soil, and the chalky clay, when saturated by rain, has, probably, no great tenacity to retain them in their upright position.

The appearance of this rude and gigantic erection of the earliest days, standing alone and untenanted on the wide and melancholy plain, is exceedingly impressive. We felt it, perhaps, the more, for we had arrived direct from London, after spending many of the preceding days under the roof of the most extraordinary edifice ever erected in modern times, where the treasures of the industry and skill of nations were gathered within, and where vast multitudes, as many as would make up the population of a considerable city, thronged, day after day, to behold the wonders of beauty and art collected there for their inspection and gratification, and instruction. We had, as it were, the two ends of time before our mind's eye. Perhaps, to have seen Stonehenge to perfection, a fine day, with the sky overspread with clouds, but without rain, would have rendered the spot more deeply impressive. But we were thankful for our good fortune, and were not at all disposed to find fault. Since my return home, I have read whatever I could lay my hands on about Stonehenge, and the result of my enquiries may be truly given in a line of Byron's:

"All that we know is, nothing's to be known."

Nennius, the 'Trials of the Welch Bards,' Geoffrey of Monmouth, Henry of Huntingdon, Polydox Veisil, Jugde Jones, Bishop Gibson, Dr. Stokeley, Dr. Smith, Edward Knox, Mr. Davies, Godfrey Higgins, Dr. Kilto, and a wilderness of other learned Thebans, have given their opinions—none of which, as far as I can see, is worth a pinch of snuff. H. Browne's I admire more than any other, for, in his Illustration of Stonehenge and Abury, he endeavours to show that both these monuments were antediluvian, and even that the latter was formed under the special direction of father Adam himself. He ascribes the present dilapidated condition of Stonehenge to the effects of the Deluge, "for," he adds, "to suppose it to be the work of any people since the Flood is actually monstrous." Dr. Johnson loved an honest hater. I love a good hearty antiquarian, who is not to be stopped by trifles; and I heartily thank H. Browne that he gave me his authority for imagining that, somewhere about the middle of last month, I actually feasted my organ of veneration by seeing and laying my hands on a building created by

"The fathers of the world before the flood."

Exercise helps the faculties—and it must needs strengthen your Imagination to give her a good flight betimes.

I should tell you that the visitor's wonder is greatly increased when he learns that the nearest place to Stonehenge from whence those huge monoliths could have been drawn is about 16 English miles off; and, as the Plain is not a dead level, but undulating like the rolling prairies, it is difficult to imagine how such enormous masses, weighing many tons, could have been conveyed, since, with all the appliances of modern art, it would be a work of considerable difficulty, and requiring powerful mechanical contrivances.

But I am not about to write a dissertation. I merely wished to give you some idea of an object of which you have surely often read, and which I contemplated with exceeding great interest. On our return to Salisbury, and refreshing ourselves after our antiquarian investigations, we sallied forth to survey the vast and very beautiful Cathedral, which was built somewhere between the years 1220 and 1260, and, as it was completed in an unusually short number of years, is said to be the most perfect in England. I shall attempt no description, and shall merely say that I have never inspected any similar building so thoroughly and with so much pleasure, and all the more so as it formed a kind of centre piece between Stonehenge and the Crystal Palace. The evening was very beautiful and serene; the old building looked stately and gorgeous in the midst of its ancient trees on the verge of the pretty and picturesque little town; and, in short, we returned *to town*, greatly pleased with our trip to the west. We reached London a little after midnight, and, after a repetition of the morning's walk of about two miles, reached our lodgings at the modest hour of one in the morning. This is a very long-winded history of a trifling trip; but as, until I went myself, I had never encountered any one who had seen Stonehenge, I thought you would be amused by some particulars from the pen of a courageous traveller, who has the further merit of being a man of weight and a friend of your cause.

We have just now in Dublin a slight, low sized, brown, dark eyed, Spanish looking Scotchman, with an eager face, whose name is Robert Edmund. You remember the name. He was tarred and feathered by the South Carolinian Chivalry about three years ago—and has been for some months past travelling in his native country telling his story. I have seen him frequently, and have enjoyed his company exceedingly. He has been a good deal among the New England Abolitionists, and appreciates them thoroughly—although I think Garrison, Stephen and Abby K. Foster, and Theodore Parker, strike his fancy particularly. He has a peculiarity rather uncommon amongst that class of people who live by lecturing, and whose bread in some degree depends upon conciliating the good opinion of those amongst whom they move. I mean that he says what he thinks, and blurts out his opinions of men and things, and, more hazardous still, his opinion of opinions, with a raciness an honesty, an absence of disguise that are truly refreshing, and as rare as they are pleasant. Garrison's earnestness, Abby K. Foster's personal dignity, eloquence and pluck; her husband's dauntless courage, unsparing severity, and martyr spirit, as genuine as that of Ridley and Latimer, and Theodore Parker's devotedness and resolute self-attention, all delight him beyond measure, so that he is never tired talking of them. And he talks so fluently and so thoroughly *con amore*, that you not only cannot choose but hear, but are heartily glad to listen. He seems to me very unprejudiced and unsophisticated, and to have a real relish for the hearty honesty, courage, and truthfulness of the Abolitionists. He don't talk to please you, but to ease his own mind. When he goes to England—if he goes—I take him to be the very man that will have no chance at all wherever the sway of the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society extends. They would find him out and would throw a wet blanket over him immediately. I can't imagine a man whom John Scoble would have greater pleasure in putting down.

I find from the papers that a very different man, Archbishop Hughes, of New York, has just been denouncing to the New Yorkers the revolutionary spirit prevailing in Europe, and has declared that this is the natural result of the republican form of government. No doubt of it. If many such as he attain the power they are continually laboring for in America, your republic will soon be only a republic in name. The spirit of priestcraft and the spirit that produced the Fugitive Slave Bill will be sure to work harmoniously together. They are both equally diabolical. The merchant for money, the slaveholder for power, the priest for the control of men's bodies and souls will dare anything, will sacrifice anything. Patriotism, religion and humanity are thrown to the winds by them now with as perfect indifference as ever they were in "the good old times" by the Friends of Milton's Hell.

You will be glad to know that, by a letter from a zealous friend of the Crafts, I have just heard that they are both comfortably settled and doing well, at our industrial and educational school in the South of England, where they are most kindly treated, and are resolutely endeavouring to obtain that amount of book-learning which is essential to enable them, with industry and kind friends, to make their way respectably in their adopted country.

Yours ever truly,

RICHARD D. WEBB.

---

## Miscellaneous Items.

### CUBA.

AUTHENTIC ACCOUNT OF THE OUTBREAK AND ITS SUPPRESSION.

Great excitement existed at Havana at the time the Georgia sailed, owing to the reception of the news of the meeting held by the citizens of New Orleans in favour of the liberty and independence of Cuba.—Government received some important news the night the Georgia arrived, which resulted in the sailing of the Spanish ships of war in port, with the exception of the steamer Pizarro. This was effected in the most quiet maner possible.

On the night of the 1st instant it was rumoured that an armed force was gathering on the Florida reefs, and that a part of the fleet had been despatched in that direction. Expresses were arriving every hour from the interior, but the officials kept everything so quiet, that it was impossible to learn the particulars of events.—the government paper has been printed two days, and is said to have contained some exciting news from the interior, but its issue was prohibited until after the departure of the American steamers. Several executions, by summary court martial, had taken place, and but for the refusal of one of the regiments to fire upon the condemned, there would have been many more. Pardon has been promised to all insurgents who lay down their arms, with the exception of the leaders, who will be executed, or sent to Spain.

Those who had raised the standard of Liberty consisted of small parties, and as they acted without concert, they were easily put down by the troops. It is said that no quarter was given to those found with arms in their hands, as they were killed on the spot—Government is said to feel some anxiety with regard to the loyalty of the troops as many regiments are supposed to be disaffected. Many of the troops lately arrived from Spain have died from exposure, being unable to stand the climate.

There was a report that an insurrection had been attempted in Matanzas, and troops had been ordered to march to that quarter. The result had not been heard when the Georgia sailed.

The above intelligence is furnished by the Purser of the Georgia. It is evident therefrom, that whatever disturbances had existed in the eastern part of the Island had been put down, or at least that there was nowhere any effectual opposition to the government troops. If the troops continued faithful there was no apprehension of any effectual movement among the Islanders themselves, but the eyes of the government were directed anxiously to the United States, from which, it was supposed, efforts would be made to support the insurgents.

The government were, however, on the alert, and vessels of war were on the watch at the most exposed points. Several of our own armed vessels are also on the coast of Havana before this time.

Havana papers of the 1st contain despatches from various parts of the island, most of which announce the prevalence of tranquility in the vicinities where they were written. We do not believe there have been in any part of the island disturbances of a very serious kind, nor that the participants in them have been numerous.

The *Faro Industriale* of July 29th, contains a despatch from the Commandant General of Tunas, stating that the party headed by the rebel Aguero had been completely routed, and that its remnants had submitted to the jurisdiction of Puerto Principe. A despatch dated Puerto Principe, July 23d, states that Aguero was seen on the 21st, near Jucaro accompanied by only four men, and that they appeared to be making their way towards Neuvitas in the hope of escaping from the Island. A despatch from the Governor of Neuvitas dated the 21st, stating that Augustine Aguero, Tartrga Jose Augustine Aguero, Y Sanchez and Miguel Aguero, Y Aguero had presented themselves to the commissary of the town of Baza, soliciting pardon. In short the revolution appears to be at an end—it only remains to look out for the "Fillibusteros" from the country.

---

### WANT OF LABOURERS IN JAMAICA. HENRY CLAY'S LETTER.

[From the Kingston Despatch. July 12.]

THE scaroity of labour which is experienced throughout the island at the present moment, renders it necessary that some means should be at once adopted to increase our labouring population, or it is beyond all question that many of the best sugar estates in the island must shortly be abandoned. There are not many in the towns who know the extent to which the want of labour is felt in most of the agricultural parishes. It is a melancholy fact, however, which official returns will shortly prove, that the present year's crop, which should have exceeded in quantity that of any other year since the abolition of the apprenticeship, will actually fall short of the crop of Barbadoes—an island whose area is less than that of the single parish of St Thomas in the east, but whose redundant population enables it to apply every acre to remunerative cultivation. The besetting evil of Jamaica is the extent of her acreage, and the disproportionate numbers of her population. In Barbadoes where population is redundant, and every acre of land is applied to profitable cultivation, population presses on the means of subsistence, and the people are industrious from necessity.—In Jamaica the reverse of this obtains. Here the acres are redundant, whilst the population is scanty and independent. The results are obvious. Barbadoes increases her productions, whilst Jamaica retrogrades; and Barbadoes not only increases her exports, but at the same time decreases the cost of her manufacture. The consequence is that we are told that in Barbadoes there are some estates on which the "sugar is all profit." It used to be so in the days of Slavery in Jamaica. It was said then, that the rum crop paid the expenses of the year, and that all the sugar was profit This however, is now sadly reversed in Jamaica. In many parishes—and we instance particularly the parishes of St. Mary, Metcalf, and St. George—such is the want of labour, that on numerous estates the present year's outrageous taxes must, every penny of them, be paid out of capital, whilst one-third part of the crop will have been lost for want of the labour to take it off.

The question then arises, how Jamaica can act for herself, since Earl Grey has resolved that the government, at any rate, shall not act for her? We have more than once directed attention to the United States, as a source from which a large free coloured population might be derived; and although it is unquestionable that much discrimination is necessary in the choice of the people, whose emigration to Jamaica would be useful and desirable, still we are convinced that there is a large number of persons in the Southern States whose transfer to Jamaica would be of the greatest value at the present moment. What we want in Jamaica is population—a population whose numbers shall, in some measure, press upon the means of subsistence. America could supply a hundred thousand of these, every one of whom would be useful as an inhabitant, if he were not valuable as an agriculturist. But if the people were carefully selected; and if none but the really industrious were engaged to emigrate to Jamaica, on the assurance that they would receive ready wages, in proportion to the work they performed, we are of opinion that a most valuable addition might be made to the population of Jamaica, by means of immigration from the United States.

Considerable difficulties stand in the way of the voluntary expatriation of the American blacks. The American Anti-Slavery Societies offer the principal obstruction to the emigration of this class of American people; and next to these Societies, "the African Colonisation Society," whose efforts are directed to the establishment of a black republic on the coast of Africa, under the designation of Liberia, has offered impediments to the emigration of free coloured people to the West Indies, which, if continued, might still operate injuriously to the efforts which are being made to induce the coloured people to migrate to a climate infinitely better suited to their constitutions, and to a community whose liberal institutions offer civil advantages so far beyond any they can enjoy in the United States.

It would appear, however, that the African Colonisation Society is not likely to offer any further resistance to the emigration of the coloured people of America to Jamaica. We have much gratification in subjoining a very interesting letter of Henry Clay, Esq., addressed to Mr. Thomson Hankey, of London, on this very important subject—a letter which is deserving of the deepest consideration of the people of Jamaica. There are a large number of worthless free people in the U. States; but there are also a vast number of coloured people whose residence in Jamaica would be of infinite value. Let us try if we cannot secure those latter. Indiscriminate emigration from America would be injurious; but a judicious selection of really industrious people from the South, would help us in our present dearth of labour; and we hope every effort will be directed to a trial of this, the readiest and the cheapest means of recruiting our labouring population.

We cannot conclude our observations better than by publishing the following letter from

MR. CLAY TO MR. HANKEY.

ASHLAND, May 16, 1851.

I have received from Thomas Hankey, Jr., Esq., of London a memorandum respecting the removal of free blacks from the United States to the British West India colonies, with the view of supplying the wants of these colonies, in regard to agricultural labour, and requesting any information which I may be able to communicate as to the practicability of effecting such removal. I have great pleasure in complying with Mr. Hankey's request as far as it is in my power.

The free coloured population of the United States amount to about half a million. The exact number will be seen as it existed in 1850 when the census taken in that year shall be published. That coloured population is dispersed throughout the whole United States, but is most concentrated in the two States of Virginia and Maryland. It consists of numbers who were born free, their ancestors many years ago having been emancipated, and of others who have been more recently liberated; the disposition of a large portion of this coloured population is to prefer a residence in our cities and villages, where they perform the menial offices of life and the lower departments of labour. What proportion of them are congregated in the cites, and who apply themselves to agricultural labour, I have no means of accurately ascertaining, but I think it probable that about half of the whole coloured population is engaged in these respective pursuits. Taken as an entire class, they are an improvident and thoughtless race, addicted to habits of vice, much more extensively than any other portion of our population. There are, however, many gratifying exceptions. Their condition in this respect is, perhaps, partly owing to the physical and intellectual constitution of the African race, but mainly to the degraded position which they occupy in the United States, where they do not, and probably never can, enjoy equal privileges, social and political, with the whites.

I have no doubt that it would conduce to the happiness of both races if the blacks were removed from the United States by colonization or expatriation; but that object is unattainable with regard to the slave portion of that population, whilst their bondage continues to exist in the United States. How long that will be can only be matter of conjecture. My own opinion, long and deliberately entertained, is, that as they are held in Slavery for the purpose of obtaining a necessary supply of labour, Slavery will cease whenever, by the increase of the white population, free white labour can be procured cheaper than that of the blacks.

But although a separation of the slave portion of the blacks is impracticable, in consequence of their being held in Slavery, no obstacle exists with regard to the free portion of the black population, and every passing year more and more evinces the necessity of such a separation. In many of the States laws have been passed, with rigourous penalties, to prevent the free poeople of colour from settling in them, and, in one or more of the States, a proposal has been seriously made to extirpate them by compulsory means. So thoroughly have I been convinced, for a great length of time, of the expediency of the removal of the free blacks from the United States, that, in co-operation with others entertaining the same opinion, upwards of thirty years ago we established the American Colonisation Society, for transporting them, with their own consent, to the western coast of Africa, and subsequently planted the colony of Liberia. There appeared to us to be a combination of more powerful motives for colonising these people in Africa than anywhere else. There they would be returned to the country from which their ancestors came, their constitutions were well adapted to the climate, and they might, we hoped and believed, be made conducive to the introduction of Christianity, the arts, and civilization into Africa. We have had encouraging success in the work of African colonisation, and we mean to persevere in it. We persuade ourselves that the foundations of a great republic or empire have been laid on the western coast of Africa, and that, ultimately, it may be made the asylum of a large number of coloured people of the United States, and of those in future that, from whatever cause, may become free.

But, although for the reasons already stated, I have a decided preference for Africa to any other country for colonising the free blacks of the United States, there is no incompatibility between the object of transporting them to Africa and that of sending them to the British West India colonies; whether they go to the one or the other place, the purpose of separating them from the whites in the United States and placing them where they can enjoy privileges, social and political equality, and happiness, which they cannot realize here, will be equally accomplished. By going, indeed, to the West India colonies, they would not execute the mission of religion and civilization, which, we hope, they might fulfil by emigration to Africa.

There are no laws, as far as I know of any of the States opposing obstacles to the removing of these people to the West India colonies. On the contrary, such a removal would be in perfect conformity with the polity which prevails in most of them. The American Colonization Society has found, in the abolitionists of the United States a constant opposition to the African colony. They use all the arts in their power to dissuade the free people of colour from voluntarily going to Africa, and their exertions have been attended with some success. But I think the free blacks are becoming less and less disposed to listen to the mischievous councils of their pretended abolition friends. But in any project of inducing them to go to the West India colonies, the same source of opposition ought to be anticipated.

How far the free blacks may be inclined to emigrate to the West India Colonies, I am not able to say, and it can, perhaps, only be ascertained by actual experiment; I must, however, frankly say, that I think considerable difficulty would be encountered. Some years ago, considerable numbers were induced to go to St. Domingo; but many of them, I understood, returned discontented and dissatisfied. Degraded as their condition is in the United States, the means of subsistence here are so great that their physical wants are generally well supplied; they are apparently contented and happy; and many of them are unwilling to leave the country of their birth, and the scenes to which they have been always accustomed. We have found these causes operating against the American Colonization Society, but not to an extent so great as to prevent their obtaining annually a sufficient number of emigrants to transport to Africa, and I think the obstructing causes are constantly diminishing. If the attempt be made to induce these people to go to the West India Colonies, it would be proper, I think, that suitable agents should be sent to the United States, to explain to the free blacks the advantages and privileges they would enjoy by removing to the West Indies, and to offer to them the means of their transportation. I am quite sure that no opposition would be encountered from the general government, nor do I suppose that any would be made by any of the States. The general government would probably remain passive, neither aiding or obstructing the removal of the free blacks. Perhaps some of the States, Virginia for example, might afford some assistance or facilities in their removal.

Have you ever turned attention to China as a source of labour to supply your colonies. I remember to have heard that you made an experiment with some Malays from the East Indies, and that it was not very successful or encouraging; but I have not heard of your having introduced any Chinese into your colonies. When I was in Cuba a few weeks ago, I was informed that a planter had seventy or eighty Chinese brought from northern China; employed on his estate; that he had engaged them at the very low price of four dollars per month each, for seven years; that he found them laborious and trustworthy, and that he greatly preferred them to the blacks, having better heads, and more skilful capacity in performance of their work than the blacks.

My health not being very good, I have had to employ an amanuensis, who has written this answer to your inquiries, upon my dictation. I hope you will find it intelligible, if not entirely satisfactory.

With great respect, (Signed) H. CLAY.

THOMAS HANKEY, JR, Esq., &c., &c.

---

——MADAME D'ARUSMONT'S (FANNY WRIGHT) SUIT FOR DIVORCE.—It is known that a suit has been instituted in the Courts of Ohio by this somewhat notorious woman, against her late husband who is residing in France, for divorce, alimony, and the control of their only child, a daughter. In opening the case for the defence Judge Tilden, the defendant's counsel, gave a sketch of the history of this remarkable women, which we find reported as follows in the Cincinnati *Gazette*:

"She is the daughter of a Dundee merchant, in Scotland. She received a large patrimonial inheritance from a maternal uncle, Sir Archibald Campbell, "who died on the field of honour and of victory." Having early imbibed some peculiar views relating to society, politics and religion, and finding the United States a better field for promulgating her views, she came hither in 1818, bringing with her and investing in this country, a large amount of property.

Soon after her residence here, she became interested in the condition of the slaves at the south. Numerous publications were made explaining her views upon this important subject. Not satisfied with this instrument in the prosecution of her plans, she "took the stump," traversing the principal cities of the Union, making speeches and orations in defence of her project for the eradication of Slavery, and finally settled in Tennessee where she purchased about thirty negroes and took them to St. Domingo, where she made suitable provisions for them. She soon afterwards became interested in some school of socialists, of which, we believe, that Robert Owen, of England, was the great head. The, school was afterwards, from some cause, removed to New Harmony, Indiana, where Robert Dale Owen, the son of Robert, was engaged in the new experiment, and there she established a press, of which Robert Dale Owen was the conductor. This experiment proving a failure, the type and materials were shipped to New Orleans, and from thence to New York, where it was supposed a better field was opened for the successful ultimation of her schemes. This paper was called the *Free Inquirer*, and has long since vanished from the newspaperial world. All of the various projects of this extraordinary woman, however tempered as they have been with a benevolent and self-sacrificing disposition, have proved signal failures. This, we believe, is the summing up of their history.

In one of Fanny Wright's visits to Paris, she made the acquaintance of her late husband, Mr. D'Arusmont. Between them there must have been a powerful intellectual sympathy. Mr. D'Arusmont, it appears, like his wife, had early imbibed strong republican tendencies, and had come to the United States as early as the year 1805, and had here legally declared his intention to become a permanent resident. He was the son of a judge in one of the provincial courts in the south of France, and a scion of one of the old feudal families, and of the reigning and influential political aristocracy. He was educated for the profession of the law, and is said to possess extraordinary attainments. Under Fanny Wright's patronage, long before the celebration of their marriage, Mr. D'Arusmont, who was on a temporary visit to his family in France, returned to the United States, and participated in the pursuits to which we have made reference. He returned to France in 1830, and in the same year was married to Fanny Wright, in Paris, by one of the Municipal officers of of the city. General Lafayette was present at the nuptial ceremonies. One of the papers filed in the present suit by Madame D'Arusmont, states that the chief cause of this remarkable alliance, was a disposition on her part, to make an honourable pecuniary provision for Mr. D'Arusmont, who was without means.

After the marriage, the parties came to the United States. Madame D'Arusmont itinerated in the prosecution of her original plans, and her husband was occupied in the management of the estate, and in the evolvement of some plans for the education of youth, which he had commenced in France, but had been compelled to abandon from the annoyance of the police.—Under the patronage of a Mr. Macclure, a man of fortune in Scotland, Mr. D'Arusmont pursued his experiments in elaborating and putting into practical operation his theory of education. Pupils were secured, and the school was opened in Philadelphia, was afterwards removed to New Harmony, and finally to Paris, where letters patent were granted by the French government, and the school was placed on a permanent basis. Mr. D'Arusmont has devoted long life to these educational pursuits, and is we believe, at present engaged in his favourite studies.

One daughter, now under the guardianship of Mr. D'Arusmont, is the result of this singular marriage. The domestic history of these parties, and the immediate causes leading to their separation, have not yet been reviewed in this argument. It does appear, however, that a division of the joint property was made at the time of separation. Some of the income of both parties is derived from bonds and mortgages in New York, an estate in Scotland, one in Tennessee, and an investment in or near Cincinnati. The defence claims that the plaintiff, now praying for alimony, has already had set off to her an income of two thousand dollars, while Mr. D'Arusmont's income is but little, if any more, than one thousand dollars per annum.

——SINGULAR TRIAL.—The *Tribune* says that a Court Martial was recently held at Fort Columbus, at this port, for the trial of a soldier, who is a Roman Catholic. The charge preferred against him was, that he refused to attend a Protestant place of worship. His name was James Duggan, and for this he was sentenced to forfeit to the United States $6 a month of his pay, for six months, to spend two months in solitary confinement and on bread and water, the other months at hard labour, with ball and chain to his leg. This sentence, which was in part approved by Gen. Wool, came up for revision before the Secretary of War, Hon C. M. Conrad, and was by him set aside, as will be seen by the following:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 15, 1851.

SIR—Complaints have been made to this Department that a soldier at Fort Columbus, who is, or was, a Roman Catholic, was ordered to attend a Protestant church, and on his refusal to obey the order he was punished for disobedience of orders. It is doubtful how far an officer has the right to compel officers and men under his command to attend divine service; it is evident, however, that no one ought to be compelled to attend a church of any other persuasion than that to which he belongs.

Every means of persuasion should be employed to induce soldiers to attend some church, but they should be permitted to select the one they prefer. And when they profess to have conscientious scruples about attending any particular church, all compulsory measures violate the rights of conscience, and should be avoided.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,
C. M. CONRAD, Sec'y of War.

Brevet Major Gen. JOHN E. WOOL.

Such a piece of official tyranny as this of the Fort Columbus officers, would disgrace Haynau. We hope to hear of no more such zeal on the part of public officers; that religious devotion which descends to contemptible tyranny like this is of a suspicious character, and looks much more like the promptings of human pride than true Christianity. Yet perhaps there should be charitable allowances made: the millenium has not arrived, the lion and the lamb do not yet lie down together, war and religion are yet too widely dissonant for us to expect the harmony of the latter in the camp of the former.

——MR. WEBSTER ON SECESSION.—The following letter from the Secretary of State was addressed to a gentleman of North Carolina, who desired his opinion on the question of the right of a State to secede from the Union.

AUGUST 1, 1851.

DEAR SIR: I have received your letter of the 20th July.

The Constitution of the United States recognises no right of secession, as existing in the people of any one State or any number of States. It is not a limited Confederation, but a Government; and it proceeds upon the idea that it is to be perpetual, like other forms of Government, subject only to be dissolved by revolution.

I confess I can form no idea of secession but as the result of a revolutionary movement. How is it possible, for instance, that South Carolina should secede and establish a Government foreign to that of the United States, thus dividing Georgia, which does not secede, from the rest of the Union?

Depend upon it, my dear sir, that the secession of any one State would be but the first step in a process which must inevitably break up the entire Union into more or fewer parts.

What I said at Capron Springs was an argument addressed to the North, and intended to convince the North that if, by its superiority of numbers, it should defeat the operation of a plain, undoubted and undeniable injunction of the Constitution, intended for the especial protection of the South, such a proceeding must necessarily end in the breaking up of the Government—that is to say, in a revolution.

I am, dear sir, your obedient servant,
DANIEL WEBSTER.

——ONE OF THE CHIVALRY OFFENDED.—On Thursday afternoon, a gentleman in New Bedford, from Charleston, S. C., who proposed to make a stay of a number of days, being in a store on Purchase street, in company with some acquaintances from the South whom he came to visit, about 4 o'clock, P. M., chanced to take up the *Standard*, then lately delivered. Happening to let his eye fall on a notice of the celebration by the coloured people to-day, he exclaimed, "What's this?" then, reading on, "I can't see it! I can't bear it! I must go immediately." Despite the remonstrances of his friends, who urged him to stay, he accordingly hastened away, upon the instant, and turned his back on the city, impelled by dread of seeing people with dark skins rejoicing over the liberation of their brethren from life-bondage. The gentleman is a European, but has been some twelve years in our Southern States.

As this paragraph will meet his eye, as he was a stranger here, and, we have no doubt, from what we learn, an amiable and excellent man, we wish to say nothing discourteous, or that would needlessly wound his feelings; but we would beg him to consider whether it is precisely consistent for a citizen of a country which boasts in its bill of rights, that "all men are born FREE and equal," and "are endowed BY THEIR CREATOR with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, LIBERTY, and the pursuit of happiness," to manifest such painful sensitiveness at the idea of one class of its inhabitants rejoicing at the emancipation of an oppressed and suffering people, merely because the victims of injustice and those who rejoice at their freedom happen to have "a skin not coloured like our own."—*N. Bedf. Stand.*

——SERVED HIM RIGHT.—The New York Mirror, of late, has tried to curry favour with the South, by justifying New York from any want of subserviency, and by throwing the burden of free-soil doctrines upon Boston.

But thus contemptuously and arrogantly does the *South Carolinian* administer the proper rebuke to the base apology of the *Mirror*:

"We have no faith in all this cant, nor in the alleged change of location among the Boston merchants. A Boston merchant will not change his instinct by moving to Pearl or Wall street. If he was an abolitionist in Boston he will be none the less one because he hangs out his sign in N. York. The Mirror knows full well that if "the New York merchants as a body" had chosen to choke fanaticism when it was a puling and sickly imp, they might have destroyed it forever. But they petted it, flirted with it, fondled, fed and nourished it, and that too not ignorantly, until it has mastered them. The cry of *peccavi* comes too late, and savors too strongly of hypocrisy to be believed. Even at a later day, had "the merchants of New York in a body" used their influence, all powerful almost, could they not have prevented the election of Seward and Fish. No, they send the most incendiary abolitionists to the Senate of the United States, in which body we alone looked for conservatism, and then we are told with this brazen and cool impudence that 'the merchants of New York as a body' are sound. Gammon!"

Here the *South Carolinian* shows itself to be unaware of the truth, that the merchants of the North do not hold all the votes of the North in their hands, in the same manner in which the planters control those of the South. Were that in fact the case, there might be, instead of fifteen, thirty-one Slave States before next Christmas.—*Boston Commonwealth.*

---


THE EIGHTEENTH NATIONAL

## ANTI-SLAVERY BAZAAR.

TO BE HELD IN BOSTON, MASS., DURING THE CHRISTMAS WEEK OF 1851.

IN ADDRESSING the Friends of the Anti-Slavery

## Miscellany.

### TAHITI.

MADAME IDA PFEIFFER, of Vienna, a lady, favourably known to the reading public of Germany as the pleasant narrator of a Pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and of various Tours in different parts of Europe, has recently published an account of her Travels round the World. In her preface, she states that an uncontrollable desire to travel, and to see distant and little known regions, impelled her to undertake the bold enterprise, the details of which are now recorded in three little volumes, entitled "A Lady's Travels round the World."* In the course of so extensive a circuit, much that is curious and interesting must have presented itself to an intelligent observer like Madame Pfeiffer. We subjoin, with some abridgment, her account of Tahiti and its inhabitants.

It may be well to premise, that until lately Tahiti was under the protection of England, but it is now transferred to France. The island was long an object of dispute between the Governments of both nations; but in November, 1846, peace was concluded. Queen Pomare, who, during the interval of contention, fled to another island, had returned to Papeiti, one of the chief cities, a few weeks before Madame Pfeiffer arrived there. Her abode was a small house containing only four rooms, and she dined every day at the residence of the Governor. A suitable abode is now being built for the Queen, by the French Government, from which Her Majesty receives a pension of twenty-five thousand francs per annum.

Papeiti, the port, is surrounded by coral-reefs, which defend it like the outworks of a fortress, and render its entrance at once difficult and dangerous. Between the rocks, against which the billows break with frightful force, a very narrow opening barely affords sufficient room for the passage of ships. On our approach, says Madame Pfeiffer, a pilot came out to us, and, in spite of a very adverse wind, we succeeded in working our way safely into the harbour. After we had landed, we were congratulated on our lucky escape; the people who were anxiously watching our entrance assured us that at one moment we nearly struck on a coral bank—an accident which had a short time previously befallen a French vessel.

Before we cast anchor, we observed some half-dozen Pirogues making towards us; and in the space of a few minutes our deck was thronged with Indians, who nimbly climbed up the ship's sides to offer us fruit and shell-fish. But these luxuries are not now, as they were in Captain Cook's time, obtained in exchange for glass beads and bits of red cloth. They are to be had for money only; and our Tahitian visitors showed us that they knew how to drive bargains and extort high prices as well as the most practised hucksters of Europe. I presented to one of the Indians a ring made of some kind of gilt metal. He took it; and after smelling it, shook his head, giving me to understand that he knew it was not made of gold. Observing a ring on my finger, he took my hand, and whilst he smelt the ring, a pleasant smile that lighted up his features seemed expressive of a request that I would give it to him.

We found Papeiti (on the 25th of April, 1847) full of French troops, and several French ships were lying in the harbour. The town, which contains between three and four thousand inhabitants, consists briefly of a range of wooden houses with gardens extending along the shore. A noble forest, crowning a range of hills, forms the background of the scene, and here and there on the upland are scattered many small huts.

The only buildings of any commodious size are the Governor's house, the French magazine, the military bakehouse (whence the barracks are supplied with bread), and the Queen's residence, not yet completed. Many little wooden houses, containing only one room, had been hastily constructed, to supply the demand for dwelling places, which, when I was there, were so scarce that French officers of rank were glad to take up their quarters in wretched Indian huts.

I looked about in vain for a lodging. Nowhere could I find a single room to let; and at length I was fain to content myself with part of a room—in short, literally a corner. This accommodation I found in a hut, occupied by a carpenter, his wife, and two children. A space about six feet in length, and four in width, was allotted to me behind the door. The floor was not boarded, and the walls were formed of staccadoes or palisades. There was neither bedstead nor chair; and yet, for this lodging, I was obliged to pay very exorbitantly.

The hut of a Tahitian Indian frequently has no walls, and consists merely of a roofing of palm-leaves supported on poles. Even those better sort of huts, which have palisadoed walls, are not divided into compartments; all comprise only one room, the dimensions of which usually vary from twenty to fifty feet in length, and from ten to thirty in breadth. The whole furniture consists of mats of plaited straw, some coverings for beds, a few wooden chests, and possibly one or two jointed stools; the latter, however, rank among superfluities. Of cooking utensils or apparatus, the Indians possess none. Their food is all baked in stone ovens. The stones are heated, and the meat is put into the oven without any dish. At table, one knife suffices for a whole party; and a cocoa-nut shell serves as a basin to contain water for their drink.

The missionaries who have successively resided here during the last fifty years, have wrought a change in the dress of the natives, especially those in the neighbourhood of Papeiti. Still, however, their costume is sufficiently characteristic of savage life. Both men and women wear a garment called the *pareo;* it is a sort of petticoat made of coloured cloth and fastened round the waist by a band. By the women it is worn long enough to descend to the ankles; but the men have it much shorter, reaching only to the knee. The men wear a short shirt of coloured cotton over the *pareo;* and under it they frequently have loose trousers. The upper garment of the women is a sort of long full blouse. Both sexes wear flowers in their ears instead of ear-rings, the hole in the lobe of the ear being bored sufficiently large to admit of flower stalks being easily drawn through it. The Tahitian women, old as well as young, adorn themselves profusely with flowers and foliage, of which they form very tasteful wreaths and bouquets. I also frequently saw men wearing wreaths round their heads. On holidays and other festive occasions, they wear, in addition to their ordinary dress, an upper garment called the *tiputa.* This is made of a material of their own manufacture, prepared from the bark of the bread-fruit and cocoa-nut trees. The bark, when newly stripped from the tree, is beat and pressed with stones until it becomes as thin as paper; after which it is coloured yellow and brown.

I visited a little wooden building used as a place of worship. It was thronged by Indians, all of whom had been converted to Christianity. They called themselves Protestants; but, of the faith they professed they knew nothing but the name. Before entering the house of prayer they all divested themselves of their floral ornaments, with which they again decorated themselves on departing. Some of the women wore black satin blouses; others, who were resolved on being particularly fine, appeared in bonnets—gay creations of Parisian millinery, of a fashion which has been obsolete for at least half-a-dozen years. It is impossible to conceive the ludicrous effect produced by the broad, flat faces of these Tahitian belles, under their fantastically shaped bonnets.

Whilst the psalms were being sung, an air of devotion pervaded the congregation, many of whom joined in the singing with tolerable correctness; but during the delivery of the sermon, the clergyman was listened to with the utmost indifference. The children were engaged in playing, quarrelling, and eating; and of the grown-up portion of the assembly, those were not not gossipping were sound asleep. I was assured that most of the natives are able to read and that many of them can write; but, during worship in the church, I saw only two individuals (aged men) make use of their bibles.

The Tahitians are tall in stature, and strongly made. Men of six feet high are by no means uncommon. The women are likewise tall, and, in general, very stout. The men are decidedly handsomer than the women. Both sexes are alike remarkable for beautiful white teeth, and fine dark eyes; all have very large mouths, thick lips, and broad, flat noses; the latter are so highly admired that, as soon as an infant is born, it is customary to press down the cartilages of the nose, in order to give to the feature the broad, flat form which is an indispensable condition of Tahitian beauty. Both men and women have long black hair, which hangs down their backs in one or two thick plaits. The complexion of these islanders is copper colour.—Nearly all of them are tattooed on the lower limbs; but the hands, feet, and all other parts of the body, are free of these ornaments. The figures employed in this tattooing, chiefly arabesques, are frequently executed with much artistic taste.

The Governor of Tahiti, M. Bruat, made arrangements for some grand public festivities on the first of May, in honour of the *fete* of Louis Philippe. In the forenoon, a sham sea-fight was got up under the superintendence of the sailors belonging to the French ships in the port. This being ended, the spectators adjourned to a meadow to witness feats of agility, exhibited by some of the natives in climbing a Maypole. At the summit of this pole coloured handkerchiefs and other trifles were the prizes won, to those who were lucky enough to reach them. At noon the principal native chiefs were invited to a grand feast prepared for them on the lawn fronting the Governor's house. The banquet consisted of salt meat, bacon, bread, roasted pigs, and fruits of various kinds. But the guests, instead of sitting down, as was expected they would, to partake of the delicacies provided for them, divided the whole into portions, and each carried his share home with him. In the evening there were fireworks, illuminations, and a ball.

I was present at this ball, and was vastly amused and interested. The assembled company exhibited the most ludicrous contrasts of art and nature. Elegant Parisian ladies were seated, side by side, with coarse, swarthy, native females; and French staff officers, in full uniform, might be seen holding conversation with half-naked Indians. Several of the natives, desirous of making a particularly elegant appearance on this occasion, wore loose white trousers; others had no other clothing then the *pareo* and the loose shirt over it. One of the chiefs, arrayed in this costume, was a most pitiable object; he was perfectly crippled by *elephantiasis.*

On the occasion of this ball I saw Queen Pomare for the first time. Her figure is tall and stout, but very well formed. She is thirty-six years of age, but fresh and blooming; and I have observed that the women of Tahiti retain their youthful appearance to a more advanced period of life than the women of other warm climates. The countenance of Queen Pomare is pleasing, and is almost continually animated by a good-humoured smile. She wore a robe of azure-blue satin, made very full, and somewhat in the form of a blouse. It was trimmed with rich black blonde, set on in double rows. In her ears she wore sprigs of jasmin, and a profusion of flowers were wreathed in her hair. In her hand she held a beautifully-worked cambric handkerchief, trimmed with very rich broad lace. On that evening she wore stockings and shoes; but Her Majesty, on ordinary occasions, goes barefooted. I was informed that the dress worn by Queen Pomare at this ball was a present from King Louis Philippe.

The Queen's Consort, who is somewhat younger than herself, is exceedingly handsome. The French have surnamed him "*Prince Albert of Tahiti,*" not only on account of his good looks, but because, like Prince Albert in England, he is not the King Regnant. At the ball he appeared in the uniform of a French General officer, and wore it with tolerable grace.

Besides Queen Pomare and her Consort, there was another royal personage in the company. This was King Otoume, the sovereign of one of the neighbouring islands. He was dressed in the most comical style imaginable. He wore a pair of white trousers very wide and short. Over his other garments was a kind of surtout, made of cotton of bright canary colour. It had evidently been made in imitation of a European coat; but its shape and style of fitting proclaimed it to be a production of native genius, rather than the handiwork of a Parisian tailor. The King was bare-footed.

The Queen's ladies in waiting, four in number, were dressed in blouses of white muslin. They also had flowers for ear ornaments, and wreaths in their hair. Their manners and deportment were not devoid of grace. These young ladies danced quadrilles with some of the French officers, but it was painful to see them dance with their bare feet; and I was continually apprehensive that their toes would be trodden on by their partners' boots. Except the Queen and her Consort, none of the natives had shoes or stockings. A few of the more elderly females wore faded old fashioned bonnets for headdresses; and several young mothers were accompanied by their children—even infants in arms.

A short time before supper was announced, the Queen withdrew into an adjoining apartment to smoke a cigar; and whilst her Majesty was thus engaged, her Consort amused himself by a game at billiards.

At supper, I had the honour of sitting between Prince Albert of Tahiti and the canary-coloured King of Otoume. Both were sufficiently initiated in the rules of good breeding to show me such ordinary marks of attention as filling my glass with water or with wine, helping me to the dishes near them. It was evident that they took vast pains to imitate European manners. Nevertheless, some of the guests now and then committed themselves, by doing the most extraordinary things. The Queen herself, having desired her attendant to bring her a plate, placed upon it a large assortment of sweetmeats and dainties, which her Majesty selected for the purpose of carrying them home with her. It was also found necessary to check several of her company in their too copious libations of champagne; but, on the whole, the party, though exceedingly merry, was tolerably decorous.

I subsequently dined several times with the Royal Family at the residence of the Governor. On those occasions, the Queen, as well as her husband, appeared in the national costume—the coloured *pareo,* and the loose upper garment; both were barefooted. The heir to the throne, a boy of nine years of age, is already betrothed to the daughter of a neighbouring king. The future bride, who is two or three years older than the prince, resides at the court of Queen Pomare. She has been brought up in the Christian religion, and has been taught the English language.

Tati, the principal native chief of the island, who had come to the port to be present at the festivities on the first of May, was now about to return, with his family, to his residence at Papara; and a French officer, who was to escort the chief, proposed that I should join the party. To this proposition I very readily acceded: and on the 4th of May we embarked in a sailing-boat to proceed along the coast of Papara, a distance of thirty-six nautical miles.—Tati, the chief, a venerable old man, ninety years of age, perfectly well remembered the landing of Captain Cook. His father, at that time first chief of the island, formed a close friendship with Cook; and, in conformity with a custom then prevalent in Tahiti, he changed names with the English navigator.

Tati receives from the French Government an annual pension of six thousand francs, which at his death, will revert to his eldest son. He had with him his wife, a young woman, apparently about twenty-five years of age, and five of his children, the offspring of a previous marriage. The lady who travelled with us was his fifth wife.

We passed several interesting points as we sailed along the coast. Nor was the sea itself less interesting than the romantic scenery on shore. Our little skiff glided over shallows, where, through the clear crystal current, every pebble,—nay, almost every grain of sand was perceptible. Looking down through the translucent waves, I beheld groups of coral and madrepore, presenting such exquisite masses of form and colour, that I readily could have lent faith to the fanciful superstition which supposes the existence of fairy gardens at the bottom of the sea. In the wide spreading ramifications of marine vegetation might be pictured miniature groves and arabesque parterres, interspersed here and there with hillocks of sponge. Multitudes of little transparent fishes darted to and fro, revelling in colour and radiance, the variegated hues of the butterfly, and the brightness of the glow-worm. These tiny fishes were scarcely an inch in length. For splendour of colouring, I scarcely ever beheld anything to equal them. Some were of clear azure blue, some bright yellow, and others, nearly transparent, exhibited richly shaded tints of brown and green.

We had left Papeti about noon; and at six o'clock, when the sun was setting, it was resolved that we should not pursue our course further that evening, as the numerous rugged cliffs which fringe that part of the coast render the passage somewhat unsafe after dark. We therefore landed at Paya (a place situated about twenty-two miles from Papeiti) of which the sixth son of Tati is the ruling chief.

In honour of his father's visit, the young chief ordered a supper to be prepared. A pig was accordingly killed, and cooked in the Tahitian fashion. A hollow dug in the ground contained a number of stones, round which a fierce fire was kindled. Meanwhile bread-tree fruits were skinned and divided into halves by a sharp wooden hatchet. When the fire burned up, and the stones were sufficiently heated, the pig and the bread-fruits were put into the oven, and heated stones laid over them. The whole was then covered over with leaves, branches of trees, and finally with a layer of earth.

Whilst the supper was being cooked by this process, the table was laid out. A straw mat having been spread on the ground, large leaves, intended to serve as plates, were placed upon it. As a drinking cup, each guest was furnished with a cocoa-nut shell; half filled with a sort of acid veverage, called *Mati.*

In about an hour-and-a-half supper was announced to be ready; and though the pig was not prepared in the most tempting style, yet it was consumed with inconceivable rapidity. By the help of a single knife the pig was divided into as many portions as there were individuals to partake of it; and each one was helped to his or her share, together with half a bread-fruit, placed on a leaf. Excepting the French officer, old Tati, his wife, and myself, no one sat down at the rustic table; it being inconsistent with the customs of the country for the host to eat with his guests, or a child with his parent.

On our arrival at Papara, we were informed of the death of one of Tati's sons. The event had taken place a few days previously, but the funeral was deferred until the arrival of the aged chief. I visited the hut, and the attendants gave me a new pocket handkerchief, directing me to offer it as a present to the departed. This custom of offering presents to the dead, is still kept up by the Tahitians—even those among them who have become converts to Christianity. The body lay in a coffin, resting on a low bier; both coffin and bier were overspread with a sort of white paint or lacker. Before the bier two straw mats were spread. On one of these mats were placed all the clothes, drinking-cups, knives, &c., which had belonged to the deceased. On the other lay a vast collection of presents, consisting of shirts, paros, handkerchiefs, bits of cloth, &c.,

I attended the ceromony of the interment. The priest delivered a short oration over the grave, and when the coffin was lowered, the mats, the straw hat, and the clothes of the deceased, together with some of the presents, were thrown into the grave.—In the vicinity of the place of interment there were some ancient Indian tombs called *Murais.* They were quadrangular spaces surrounded by stone walls four or five feet high. Within the *Murai* or quadrangle, the corpse used to be laid, resting on a wooden framework. There it was left until nothing remained but the skeleton, which was afterwards buried in some sequestered spot.

After my return from Papara, I made a visit to Venus Point, a little tongue of land, on which Captain Cook stationed himself to observe the transit of Venus over the sun's disk. The stone on which his telescope was fixed is still on the spot where it then was.

One of my most interesting excursions was to Fontana and the Diadem. Fontana is a point which the Tahitians considered to be impregnable, and where, nevertheless, they sustained the most signal defeat by the French during the last war. Governor Brouat obligingly lent me his horse to make this excursion, and he sent with me as a guide a sub-officer, who had been engaged in the action, and who explained to me the positions and movements of the hostile forces.

For the space of six miles I rode through thick forests and deep ravines, intersected by mountain torrents. In many parts of these ravines, extremely narrow passes are flanked on either side by steep and inaccessible mountains; so that here, as in ancient Thermopylæ, a small band of brave warriors were enabled to keep at bay a strong and numerous army. The defiles of Fontana may be said to be the key to the whole island. During the late war Fontana was the principal stronghold of the Tahitians, and the only mode by which the French could hope to carry the important position was by climbing up an almost perpendicular precipice, and thereby reaching a narrow ridge near the summit. General Brouat announced his wish that this dangerous enterprise should be entrusted only to volunteers; and sixty-two men were selected from the very considerable number who eagerly offered themselves. After twelve hours of difficult and perilous exertion, the gallant adventurers at length gained the summit.—As soon as they appeared in sight, the dismayed Indians threw down their arms, exclaiming, "These are not men, for that steep acclivity is inaccessible to mortal footsteps. They must be spirits; therefore let us surrender, for it is needless to attempt defence."

At Fontana, a little fort, surmounted by a watch-tower, has been built. It is reached by a foot-path running along a narrow mountain ridge, beneath which yawns a chasm of unfathomable depth. For persons liable to vertigo, it would be dangerous to attempt to walk along this path, which, however, commands a magnificent prospect over the surrounding country. Mountains, valleys, ravines, and waterfalls diversify the romantic scene; and high above every other object in the landscape towers the Diadem. I reached that colossal mass of rock after a three hours' ride along a very difficult road. The prospect from the Diadem is still grander than that from the fort, extending in two directions, far beyond the boundaries of the island, and to some distance over the sea.

This was my last excursion in the lovely Island of Tahiti.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

### THE EDINBURGH REVIEW AND ITS CONTRIBUTORS.

WITHIN a year of half a century ago, and on a summer night, three young men were gaily chatting on the literature of the day, on the want of spirited periodicals, and on the feasibility of founding a new one, in a garret in Buccleuch-place, an obscure street in the old town of Edinburgh. Two of them were Edinburgh men, and students of law, although the one purposed to join the bar of his native city, and the other that of London; the third, their companion, was an English curate to whom his patron, the squire of his parish, had committed the care of a son while pursuing his studies at the then famous University of Edinburgh. The aspirant to the honours of the Scottish bar was slender and diminutive in figure, but with eyes of sparkling brilliancy. The future English barrister was tall and spare, with a peculiar nose, and every moment indicated the "fidget." The curate had a jolly twinkle in his eye, and his form predicted obesity. These three youths were FRANCIS JEFFREY, HENRY BROUGHAM, and SYDNEY SMITH, and they were projecting *The Edinburgh Review.* Thirty years later we find them in different positions. Jeffrey had attained the highest official honours of his native country: he was Lord Advocate of Scotland, and represented its metropolis in Parliament. Sydney Smith had proved too much of a humourist and *bon vivant* to be made a Bishop, but he had risen high in the Church, and was soon to be appointed Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's.—Brougham was Lord High Chancellor of England.

Friendless, unknown, and prospectless, the three young men published the first number of *The Edinburgh Review* in October, 1802. Sydney Smith was its first editor, but he left Edinburgh the following year, when Jeffrey succeeded him, and did not relinquish the post until 1829. How the new publication succeeded, and why it succeeded, need scarcely be recapitulated now. All the daring ideas in philosophy, history, and political economy, which had been elaborated and accumulated during the eighteenth century, were unfamiliar to the general public, and *The Edinburgh Review* was the organ through which their diffusion took place. Liberalism was just rearing its head among the respectable classes, and they welcomed the advocacy of men of talent and refinement. Jeffrey sparkled, Brougham thundered, Smith humourized. Soon after their first publication, burst out the new development of literature which makes the first quarter of the nineteenth century famous — Byron, Scott, Moore, Wordsworth, Southey, Coleridge, and to this add the splendid discoveries of Davy and others in science, and it will be seen what need the public had of a knot of lively critics to prescribe or to help its judgment. Every number was a success. To have "an article in *The Edinburgh*" was deemed an honour by a man like Hazlitt. You might doubt its sagacity or its virtue, but its talent made every one read it. The sincerest religionist could scarcely refrain a laugh over one of Sydney Smith's expositions of Methodism—the few cultivators of German literature split their sides as they read Jeffrey's demolition of *Wilhelm Meister.* The disciples of Mr. Pitt trembled when they heard that Brougham had a new paper on the Continental War. As liberalism made way, its advocates in *The Edinburgh* made theirs. Of the three original projectors, Brougham alone survives, and Jeffrey may be said to have been the happiest. Unlike Brougham, he did not sway a senate, for, though his vivid and logical style was duly appreciated in the House, he was on the whole unsuccessful there. Unlike Sydney Smith, he was not the witty oracle of the highest circles; he did not, in London, attain the honours of a brilliant and commanding conversationist. But he sipped the champagne of London society, he sparkled at Holland House, he was flattered as the brilliant editor, and his last years were spent in a congenial sphere. He was a Judge in the Supreme Court of his native city, and his residence, beautifully situated some miles from Edinburgh, in a valley at the foot of the finely-wooded hills, was to the last the resort of the gifted and accomplished, whether from near at hand or from afar. He died some eighteen months ago, within a short interval from the decease of his chief literary foe, William Wordsworth.

Jeffrey ceased to be editor of *The Edinburgh* in 1829, and Sydney Smith's last article was published in 1827; but Brougham still continued for many years to contribute, and, indeed, is still occasionally understood to contribute, although it is said *The Law Review* is the organ which he chiefly favours. But some years before his withdrawal, Jeffrey had secured the services of two contributors, both of whom, in some respects, and one of them especially, almost made amends for his own and Sydney Smith's absence: they were Thomas Babington Macaulay and Thomas Carlyle. About the year 1825, Macaulay, then a young student at Cambridge, and utterly unknown, although he had published some spirited lyrics in an Edinburgh magazine, despatched, without acquaintance or introduction, his famous paper on Milton to the editor of *The Edinburgh Review.* Under such circumstances an ordinary editor would have thrown it aside, but Jeffrey was not an ordinary editor, and Macaulay became an accepted, a favoured, and a constant contributor. Up to 1835, when he went to India, almost every number contained an article from his brilliant pen, chiefly on the history and literature of England during the last two centuries, precisely the class of subject most fitted to interest. On his return from India appeared his striking article on Lord Bacon; and to his residence there we owe, no doubt, the familiar colouring which invests two of the best of his essays—those on Clive and Warren Hastings. Of late years, the composition of his *History* has withdrawn him from *The Edinburgh.* The last article of his there, that we remember, was that upon Barrère, a tremendous invective against the "Anacreon of the Guillotine." It was read in MS., as we have heard from one present, at Holland House, before a distinguished party of literary people; for Lady Holland, long after the death of her husband, and though fragile and decrepid, maintained the traditionary reputation of the mansion as a hothouse of literature and art: and one of the chief of her few visits out of doors was to the library of the British Museum, where her apparition in a wheeled chair (for she could not walk) will not be easily forgotten. Thomas Carlyle, on the other hand, though a far less popular writer than Macaulay, produced a profound impression on the thoughtful and serious minds of the time. His articles began in 1827, and for six years he was a pretty regular contributor. Yet, how different from Jeffrey! Jeffrey had depreciated Burns: in the pages of the same review, Carlyle penned a noble and massive panegyric of the Scottish Peasant. Jeffrey had condemned German literature in the mass and in detail—had "cut up" Goethe, and sneered at Richter as a clumsy and low-bred sentimentalist: Carylyle put forth his utmost powers to proclaim modern German literature as little less than a new revelation. Jeffrey had sung the praises of modern progress, and the triumphs of machinery—Carlyle, in *The Signs of the Times,* asserted that these boasted triumphs were leading to the subjugation of mind by matter. These heterodox opinions did not fail to startle the ordinary contributors to the *Review.* We have heard it said, but cannot vouch for the truth of the anecdote, that on the publication of Carlyle's remarkable piece, entitled "Characteristics," Lord Brougham declared that he would write no more in *The Edinburgh* if "that man's" articles were suffered any longer to appear. It is creditable to Jeffrey and to Carlyle that no differences of opinion interfered to impair a friendly intimacy. To the last they were on terms, and the only time we ever visited Lord Jeffrey's mansion, there lay on his drawing-room table Carlyle's *French Revolution,* a gift from the author.

On the resignation of Jeffrey, the editorship of the *Review* devolved upon Mr. Macvey Napier, an Edinburgh Advocate, and the editor of that bulky specimen of publishing enterprise, the *Encyclopædia Britannica.* Mr. Napier continued to be editor up to the time of his death, some eight or ten years ago. He was a man of tact and industry, though not of shining parts; the *Review* had received a powerful impulse when placed in his hands, and if it a little lost it during his management, it was no fault of his. *The Edinburgh Review* continued to be the organ of the Whigs, but then it was of the Whigs in power, not out of it. Its tone was more defensive than offensive; its party, from the besiegers, had become the besieged. The organ which had once been thought too liberal was now, for some, not liberal enough; and the ardent Radicals of the Bentham School, with Mr. James Mill at their head, started *The Westminster* in rivalry. Still, on the whole, *The Edinburgh* maintained its pre-eminence. Though literature was not as it had been, and with the Reform Bill expiried the series of works which, commencing with *Childe Harolde* and ending with the *Waverly Novels,* had given such scope for critical power, the apparent loss was, perhaps, in reality a gain. The articles more and more assumed the appearance of original essays, for which new books only served as a pretext. Macaulay often dismissed in a sentence the work whose title was prefixed to his article. Mr. George Moir, then Professor of Belles Lettres in Edinburgh University, produced a charming series of articles on the classical literature of England, written in a style remarkable for flexibility and melody, and among which a paper on Sir Thomas Browne stands out distinctly in our memory. Philosophy found, in the pages of *The Edinburgh,* its profoundest British expositor, Sir William Hamilton, now Professor of Logic at Edinburgh, a man who, above all living men, is most deeply versed in the history of metaphysical thought, and who at present forms the centre of the literary and scientific circle which still survives at Edinburgh. Political economy, the progress of manufactures, social science generally, were handled by Mr. Macculloch, the well known economist and compiler, and who has been rewarded by a lucrative post in the Stationery Office for the zeal with which he laboured to prepare public opinion for a change in the commercial policy of the country. Finally, the rhetorical and vigorous pen of Brougham was still to be traced in many an article on history and politics, lashing his foes and defending his friends with unabated ardour.

Literature has sometimes been called a republic, where a fair field and no favour is open to all comers, and genius and talent win the day. Yet something of family influence may often be traced in its arrangements. The present editor of *The Quarterly Review,* Mr. Lockhart, is a son-in-law of Sir Walter Scott: the present editor of *The Edinburgh Review,* Mr. Empson, is a son-in-law of Lord Jeffrey. Sir Walter Scott was a founder of the one, and Lord Jeffrey of the other, so that the hereditary principle is to be traced even in Literature. Mr. Empson married Lord Jeffrey's only child, and has long been a Professor in the East India Company's College, at Haileybury. Though not himself a powerful writer, he is admirably qualified for the post of editor, being a gentleman of conciliatory and winning manners, and, as he possesses a large connexion in the highest literary circles, some of the best pens in England are co-operating in contributions to the *Review.* If called on to name the characteristic feature of his editorship, we should say that he has given the *Review* a more solid, serious, and scholarly air than it wore in former years, which arises, probably, from the fact that his own pursuits have been those chiefly of philosophical speculation. Great attention has been paid to recent religious movements, especially to that of the Tractarians on the one hand, and, on the other, to that of the latitudinarian seceders from the Church, such as Mess. Froude, John Henry Newman, and Foxton. This description of article has generally proceeded from the pen of Mr. Henry Rogers, who, like the late Dr. Coooke Taylor, entered literary life under the auspices of Dr. Whateley, the present Archbishop of Dublin, and whose memoir of Edmund Burke, prefixed to the ordinary edition of his collected works, may have long been familiar to those of our readers who are also readers of the great Irishman. A survey of the present contributors to *The Edinburgh Review* takes us into every sphere of intellectual life. That article on the Russian empire and its relations to Turkey, bearing the stamp of a thoughtful and genial traveller in the East, came from Mr. Monckton Milnes, who has thrown it carelessly off after one of his eclectic breakfasts, at which a bishop has been introduced for the first time in his life to a Chartist leader, and the Superior of a Protestant order of Sisters of Charity has been chatting with Miss Harriet Martineau. The lively characterization of the satirist Churchill, and the criticism of *King Arthur,* which will delight the eager vanity of Bulwer, are from the chamber in Lincoln's Inn Fields, where Mr. John Forster, the editor of the *Examiner,* holds his levees of dramatists and authors, and has an encouraging word for each. And whose is this striking criticism on the strange novel of *Shirley,* which Miss Bronte has just sent from her father's parsonage among the lonely Yorkshire moors? It is from the pen of Mr. G. H. Lewes, of *The Leader,* the biographer of philosophy, the novelist, historian, dramatist, critic, one of the most genial and versatile of writers and companions, and of whom, when we come to the newspaper press, we shall have more to say. And then the Universities, English and Scotch, send each its quota. Professor Spalding, of St. Andrew's, wrote this survey of criticism on Shakspeare. Sir William Hamilton, of Edinburgh, writes no longer, but his place is well supplied by Professor De Morgan, of University College, in whose brawny style you trace his athletic and vigorous habits. The Professor was examined before the late Commission on the British Museum, and gave evidence strongly in favor of the new catalogue. No wonder, then, that this sturdy defence of Mr. Panizzi in *The Edinburgh* is from the pen of the Mathematician of University College. And here, from Mr. Panizzi himself, is the product of elaborate research in that vast library, into the past aggressions of past Popes on this and other kingdoms. Two other professors who contribute to *The Edinburgh,* one from Cambridge and the other from Oxford, are Mr. Venables, and Sir George Stephen, late of the Colonial Office. Miss Martineau declares that *Deerbrook* never met with fine appreciation until Mr. Venables reviewed it. The religious world of all denominations stands surprised at Sir George's papers on ecclesiastical bigraphy, and wonders who it can be that sympathizes so keenly with, and paints so vividly, devotees the most unlike—Francis Xavier and Ignatius Loyola—Isaac Taylor and William Wilberforce! Do you ask who it is that in these material days still studies philosophy, and ventures to introduce Victor Cousin to the practical English public? It is Mr. Morell, the historian of speculative philosophy, and whose large book on that topic has recommended him to the notice of Government, and procured him the honourable and congenial post of Inspector of Schools. See these two papers, which the thread of the bookbinder has brought into juxtaposition—how unlike in subject, style, and authorship: one is a keen, subtle and refined disquisition on Tennyson, and Keats, and Shelley. It comes from the flower-decked *boudoir* of Mr. Aubrey de Vere, a young Irish gentleman of fortune, and a sweet and thoughtful poet. The other, on some political topic of the day, savours strongly of Downing street—Sir David Dundas, the Judge-Advocate, may have written it, or Sir Denis le Marchant, and perhaps the Prime Minister himself deigned to glance at the proofs!

Such are some of the chief features of *The Edinburgh Review* and its contributors as they were and are.—*London "Critic."*

### THE MYSTERY OF LOUIS PHILIPPE'S BIRTH.

A French writer of some celebrity, M. Michaud, has just published a book, entitled, "The Public and Private Life of Louis Philippe, of Orleans, Ex-King of the French," in which he adopts and illustrates, by circumstantial details, a story which has long been floating about in France, of a most extraordinary purport. It is to the effect, that Louis Philippe was *not* a Bourbon, and had not a particle of royal blood in him, but was the son of a very humble Italian, whom some have supposed to be a Jew. Making use of the *Athenæum,* we give the pith of the story, which runs as follows:

That Philippe Egalite—whose character, unfortunately, affords no guarantee against the possibility of such an incident—exchanged his infant daughter for the son of a jailor, with whom he had formed an acquaintance when traveling in Italy, in order to preserve the family estates from lapsing to the crown for want of heirs male. All the incidents connected with this supposed exchange of infants, and with the events of their after-lives, have the character of romance; the time, the scene, the chief actors, and the final issues. Our readers shall see what view M. Michaud takes of the transaction:

"The virtues of the Duchess have been pointed to as a refutation of the charge of exchanging children. It has also been alleged that no inducement existed for either the husband or the wife to perpetrate such a crime. We deny not the virtues of that illustrious lady; but who can tell how far her wishes were controlled by her husband? We know that the greater part of their fortune consisted of demesnes (appanages) which, failing male issue, of necessity reverted to the crown; and that at this very period the Duchess, after having been married four years had given birth to but one child, and that a daughter, stillborn. Such was the State of affairs when the Princess and her husband set out for Italy, where, under the titles of Count and Countes de Joinville, they spent several months at a village named Modigliana, situated on the top of the Appenines. Here the Duchess proved to be in an interesting situation. The Duke, who was fond of mean society, formed an intimacy with a jailor named Chiappini, whose wife was similarly circumstanced. A bargain was entered into, that if the Duchess's offspring should prove a daughter and the jailer's a son, an interchange should be effected. Things turned out according to this anticipation, and the terms of the engagement were mutually fulfilled. The jailor received a large sum of money. His son, born at Modigliana on the 17th of April, 1773, was removed to Paris, and kept concealed till the 6th of October, when the ceremony of private baptism was gone through, as we have already seen; while the Duchess's daughter remained in Chiappini's house, and was educated as his own child, under the name of Marie Stella Petronilla, supplies being secretly sent once a year from France. According to the Memoirs of Marie Stella Petronilla, she continued long in this melancholy position, ignorant of her high birth, and very ill treated by her supposed mother, who loved her not, and lamented that son whose fate was hidden from her. The father had some idea of the truth; but, knowing the Duke only as Count de Joinville, never dreamed that he was a Prince of the blood royal of France. His reputed daughter excelled all his other children in beauty. Everything, indeed, about her indicated that she was of different blood. Her wit and precocity astonished every one. Before she had completed her seventeenth year she so captivated Lord Newburgh, a British nobleman then traveling in Italy, that he made her his wife almost against her inclination, and conducted her to a home of splendour and magnificence on the banks of the Thames. By this marriage she had several children, one of whom is now an English Peer. On the death of Lord Newburgh she succeeded to a handsome jointure, but of this she afterward forfeited a great part on her marriage with a Russian nobleman, the Baron de Sternberg. With him she lived for several years in great style, in St. Petersburg. A son was there born to her, who, while yet young, accompanied her to Italy before the death of Chiappini, whom she still regarded as her father. This man, before his death, addressed a letter to her, which altered her whole destiny, and troubled the remainder of her days."

This letter, supposing it to be real, revealed to the Baroness de Sternberg the secret of her birth. It ran as follows:

"MY LADY: I am near the term of my earthly existence, and now, for the first time, unfold the following secret, which very intimately concerns you. On the day that you were born my wife gave birth to a son. Your mother, who is long dead, was a stranger to me. A proposal to exchange my boy for you was laid before me, and, after repeated solicitations, I was prevailed on to consult my worldly interests, (for the terms were highly advantageous.) You became a member of my family, while my son was received into that of the other party. Heaven, I perceive has made up for my faults; you have been raised to a condition superior to your father's, though his rank also was noble; and, therefore, I leave the world with some peace of mind. Keep this by you as a testimony that I was not altogether deaf to the voice of conscience. In entreating you to pardon my crime, I beseech you to conceal it from mankind, that the world may never know what is now incapable of remedy. This letter will be forwarded to you after my death."

"(Signed) LAURENT CHIAPPINI."

This epistle was forwarded to her by the sons of Chiappini; though it is said they kept back some papers which might have been of great use to her in recovering the lost traces of her parentage.

"Words (says M. Michaud) can hardly express the effect produced by such a discovery on the mind of Marie Stella. Gifted with great energy and lofty sentiments, she passed at once from a position which had been excessively humiliating to a higher rank. Not a jailor, but a great lord, is her father. But who is the great lord? Impatient to fathom this mystery—unwilling to believe with the jailor, that the past evil admitted of no remedy, she made inquiries, and sought evidence in every quarter. Her efforts procured her the knowledge that her father was the Count de Joinville, a French nobleman, whose rank and fortune she was ignorant of. To learn all the truth on the subject, she set out in the beginning of the year 1828 for France, accompanied by her youngest child, Edward, son of Baron Sternberg. She found her way to the village of Joinville, of which her father had held the lordship. Here she learned that Joinville had been part of the patrimony of the House of Orleans, and that the duke, who perished on the scaffold in 1793, had sometimes traveled under that title. She visited Paris, and there made several vain efforts to reach him who had succeeded to the title and the wealth of that powerful family. She consulted many men of business, and became the dupe of sharpers and police-officers, who received much money from her by way of payment, and robbed her of a good deal more. When her means failed, she had recourse to an artifice, which considering her position and difficulties, was certainly very excusable. She made known through the public journals, that the Baroness de Sternberg was in possession of a secret of which the heirs of the Count de Joinville were much interested. Louis Philippe was not long in hearing of this; his covetous disposition already rejoiced in the hope of some addition to his immense possessions. He accordingly communicated with the Baroness through his natural uncle, the old Abbé of St. Phar, who thought that possibly he, too, might derive some worldly benefit from the adventure; but when the Royal Duke and his associate found that the secret referred to restitution, and not augmentation, the gates of the Palace Royal were hermetically closed against the Baroness. She made great efforts, but, as she was a stranger in Paris, and all her motions were watched by the police—then nothing better than the slaves of Louis Philippe—she became once more the prey of those designing men, with whom Paris swarms, who were probably the agents of him whose interest it was above all to overthrow her pretensions. A distinguished writer, whose name she does not give, but whom, from her description, we readily identify, vainly endeavoured to make interest for her with the Duchess of Angouleme. After being duped and plundered thus, she was obliged to return and renew her search in Italy. She returned from Italy, after an absence of several months, armed with fresh and important evid